arXiv:1508.01548v2 [math.LO] 23 Mar 2016

Hydra games for ω_1

Toshiyasu Arai
Graduate School of Science, Chiba University
1-33, Yayoi-cho, Inage-ku, Chiba, 263-8522, JAPAN
tosarai@faculty.chiba-u.jp

Abstract

In this paper we introduce a hydra game. Each hydra will eventually die out, but the fact is not provable in $\mathsf{KP}\omega + (\Pi_1\text{-Collection})$ with the assumption that 'there exists an uncountable regular ordinal'.

1 Introduction

W. Buchholz [5] introduced hydra games for $ID_n\,(n \leq \omega)$. The termination of hydra games is independent from ID_n since the number of moves in the games dominates every provably recursive function in the theories.

In this paper let us modify the hydra game of Buchholz. Our modification is not elegant, but easy to extend to set theories. Each hydra will eventually die out, but the fact is not provable in $T_1 := \mathsf{KP}\omega + (V = L) + (\Pi_1\text{-Collection}) + (\omega_1)$, where (ω_1) denotes an axiom stating that 'there exists an uncountable regular ordinal'. As contrasted with the proofs in [1,5], the unprovability result follows from the fact that over T_1, the termination of hydra games yields the consistency of T_1. The 'consistency proof' here is similar to one in [2]. Namely each (contradicting) proof figure is regraded as a hydra in such a way that the response of hydras to Hercules' chop corresponds to a rewriting step on proof figures.

Let us mention the contents of the paper. In sections 2, 3, and 4, let us recall Σ_1-Skolem hulls, a paraphrase of the regularity of ordinals, and ordinals for regular ordinals. All of these come from [4]. In section 5, the sets of hydras a and their responses $a[z]$ to Hercules' chop are introduced. From these a hydra game is defined, and the main theorem 5.9 is stated. In section 6, permissible ordinal assignments (hydras) $o(\Gamma)$ to sequents Γ occurring in proofs are defined, and each proof is shown to have a permissible ordinal assignment. Finally we define a rewriting step $\mathcal{P} \mapsto \mathcal{P}'$ on (finite) proofs for which there exists a permissible ordinal assignment o' such that $o'(\mathcal{P}') = (o(\mathcal{P}))[n]$ for each ordinal assignment o for $\mathcal{P}$ in section 7, and a proof of Theorem 5.9 is concluded.

2 Σ_1-Skolem hulls

Everything in this section is reproduced from [4]. Let ρ_0 denote the least ordinal above ω_1 such that $L_{\rho_0} \models (\Pi_1\text{-Collection})$.

Definition 2.1 *1.* $cf(\kappa) := \min\{\alpha \leq \kappa : \text{there is a cofinal map } f : \alpha \to \kappa\}$.

2. For $X \subset L_{\rho_0}$, $\mathrm{Hull}(X)$ denotes the set (Σ_1-*Skolem hull* of X in L_{ρ_0}) defined as follows. $<_L$ denotes a Δ_1-well ordering of the constructible universe L. Let $\{\varphi_i : i \in \omega\}$ denote an enumeration of Σ_1-formulas in the language $\{\in\}$. Each is of the form $\varphi_i \equiv \exists y \theta_i(x, y; u)\, (\theta \in \Delta_0)$ with fixed variables x, y, u. Set for $b \in X$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} r^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}(i, b) & \simeq & \text{the } <_L\text{-least } c \in L_{\rho_0} \text{ such that } L_{\rho_0} \models \theta_i((c)_0, (c)_1; b) \\ h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}(i, b) & \simeq & (r^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}(i, b))_0 \\ \mathrm{Hull}(X) & = & rng(h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}) = \{h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}(i, b) \in L_{\rho_0} : i \in \omega, b \in X\} \end{array}$$

Then $L_{\rho_0} \models \exists x \exists y\, \theta_i(x, y; b) \to h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}(i, b) \downarrow \,\&\, \exists y\, \theta_i(h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}(i, b), y; b)$.

3. The Mostowski collapsing function

$$F_X : \mathrm{Hull}(X) \leftrightarrow L_\gamma$$

for an ordinal $\gamma \leq \rho_0$ such that $F_X \restriction Y = id \restriction Y$ for any transitive $Y \subset \mathrm{Hull}(X)$.

Let us denote, though $\rho_0 \notin dom(F) = \mathrm{Hull}(X)$

$$F_X(\rho_0) := \gamma.$$

Proposition 2.2 *Let* $L_{\rho_0} \models \mathsf{KP}\omega + \Sigma_1\text{-Collection}$. *Then for* $\kappa \leq \rho_0$, $\{(x, y) : x < \kappa \,\&\, y = \min\{y < \kappa : \mathrm{Hull}(x \cup \{\kappa\}) \cap \kappa \subset y\}\}$ *is a* $Bool(\Sigma_1(L_{\rho_0}))$*-predicate on* κ*, and hence a set in* L_{ρ_0} *if* $\kappa < \rho_0$ *and* $L_{\rho_0} \models \Sigma_1\text{-Separation}$.

Proposition 2.3 *Assume that* X *is a set in* L_{ρ_0}*. Then* $r^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}$ *and* $h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}$ *are partial* $\Delta_1(L_{\rho_0})$*-maps such that the domain of* $h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}$ *is a* $\Sigma_1(L_{\rho_0})$*-subset of* $\omega \times X$*. Therefore its range* $\mathrm{Hull}(X)$ *is a* $\Sigma_1(L_{\rho_0})$*-subset of* L_{ρ_0}.

Theorem 2.4 *Let* ρ_0 *be an ordinal such that* $L_{\rho_0} \models \mathrm{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection}$*, and* $\omega \leq \alpha < \kappa < \rho_0$ *with* α *a multiplicative principal number and* κ *a limit ordinal. Then the following conditions are mutually equivalent:*

1. $L_{\rho_0} \models {}^{\alpha}\kappa \subset L_\kappa$.
2. $L_{\rho_0} \models \alpha < cf(\kappa)$.
3. *There exists an ordinal* x *such that* $\alpha < x < \kappa$, $\mathrm{Hull}(x \cup \{\kappa\}) \cap \kappa \subset x$ *and* $F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}(\rho_0) < \kappa$.
4. *For the Mostowski collapse* $F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}(y)$*, there exists an ordinal* x *such that* $\alpha < x = F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}(\kappa) < F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}(\rho_0) < \kappa$*, and for any* Σ_1*-formula* φ *and any* $a \in L_x$*,* $L_{\rho_0} \models \varphi[\kappa, a] \to L_{F_{x \cup \{\kappa\}}(\rho_0)} \models \varphi[x, a]$ *holds.*

3 Theories equivalent to T_1

Referring Theorem 2.4 we introduce a theory $T(\omega_1)$ equivalent to T_1.

Definition 3.1 $T(\omega_1)$ denotes the set theory defined as follows.

1. Its language is $\{\in, P, P_{\rho_0}, \omega_1\}$ for a binary predicate P, a unary predicate P_{ρ_0} and an individual constant ω_1.

2. Its axioms are obtained from those of $\mathsf{KP}\omega$ + (Π_1-Collection) in the expanded language[1], the axiom of constructibility $V = L$ together with the axiom schema saying that ω_1 is an uncountable regular ordinal, cf. (2) and (1), and if $P(x, y)$ then x is a critical point of the Σ_1-elementary embedding from $L_y \cong \mathrm{Hull}(x \cup \{\omega_1\})$ to the universe L_{ρ_0}, cf. (1), and if $P_{\rho_0}(x)$ then x is a critical point of the Σ_1-elementary embedding from $L_x \cong \mathrm{Hull}(x)$ to the universe L_{ρ_0}, cf. (3): for a formula φ and an ordinal α, φ^α denotes the result of restricting every unbounded quantifier $\exists z, \forall z$ in φ to $\exists z \in L_\alpha, \forall z \in L_\alpha$.

   (a) $x \in Ord$ is a Δ_0-formula saying that 'x is an ordinal'.
   ($\omega < \omega_1 \in Ord$), ($P(x, y) \to \{x, y\} \subset Ord \land x < y < \omega_1$) and ($P_{\rho_0}(x) \to x \in Ord$).

   (b)
   $$P(x, y) \to a \in L_x \to \varphi[\omega_1, a] \to \varphi^y[x, a] \tag{1}$$
   for any Σ_1-formula φ in the language $\{\in\}$.

   .

   (c)
   $$a \in Ord \cap \omega_1 \to \exists x, y \in Ord \cap \omega_1[a < x \land P(x, y)] \tag{2}$$

   (d)
   $$P_{\rho_0}(x) \to a \in L_x \to \varphi[a] \to \varphi^x[a] \tag{3}$$
   for any Σ_1-formula φ in the language $\{\in\}$.

   (e)
   $$a \in Ord \to \exists x \in Ord[a < x \land P_{\rho_0}(x)] \tag{4}$$

Remark. Though the axioms (3) and (4) for the Π_1-definable predicate $P_{\rho_0}(x)$ are derivable from Π_1-Collection, the primitive predicate symbol $P_{\rho_0}(x)$ is useful for our prof-theoretic study, cf. **Case 1** in subsection 7.3.

Lemma 3.2 *$T(\omega_1)$ is a conservative extension of the set theory T_1.*

---

[1] This means that the predicates P, P_{ρ_0} do not occur in Δ_0-formulas for Δ_0-Separation and Π_1-formulas for Π_1-Collection.

Proof. First consider the axioms of T_1 in $T(\omega_1)$. The axiom (ω_1) is codified as

$$(\omega_1)\ \exists\kappa\in Ord[\omega<\kappa=cf(\kappa)]$$

which follows from (1) in $T(\omega_1)$. Hence T_1 is contained in $T(\omega_1)$.

Next we show that $T(\omega_1)$ is interpretable in T_1. Let κ be an ordinal in the axiom (ω_1). Interpret the predicate $P(x,y)\leftrightarrow(\{x,y\}\subset Ord)\land(\mathrm{Hull}(x\cup\{\kappa\})\cap\kappa\subset x)\land(y=\sup\{F_{x\cup\{\kappa\}}(a):a\in\mathrm{Hull}(x\cup\{\kappa\})\})$. We see from Theorem 2.4 that the interpreted (1) and (2) are provable in T_1.

It remains to show the interpreted (3) and (4) in T_1. It suffices to show that given an ordinal α, there exists an ordinal $x>\alpha$ such that $\mathrm{Hull}(x)\cap Ord\subset x$.

First we show that for any α there exists a β such that $\mathrm{Hull}(\alpha)\cap Ord\subset\beta$. By Proposition 2.3 let $h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}$ be the Δ_1-surjection from the Σ_1-subset $dom(h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1})$ of $\omega\times\alpha$ to $\mathrm{Hull}(\alpha)$, which is a Σ_1-class. From Σ_1-Separation we see that $dom(h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1})$ is a set. Hence by Σ_1-Collection, $\mathrm{Hull}(\alpha)=rng(h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1})$ is a set. Therefore the ordinal $\sup(\mathrm{Hull}(\alpha)\cap Ord)$ exists in the universe.

As in Proposition 2.2 we see that $X=\{(\alpha,\beta):\beta=\min\{\beta\in Ord:\mathrm{Hull}(\alpha)\cap Ord\subset\beta\}\}$ is a set in L_{ρ_0} as follows. Let $\varphi(\beta)$ be the Π_1-predicate $\varphi(\beta):\Leftrightarrow\forall\gamma\in Ord[\gamma\in\mathrm{Hull}(\alpha)\to\gamma\in\beta]$. Then $\beta=\min\{\beta:\mathrm{Hull}(\alpha)\cap Ord\subset\beta\}$ iff $\varphi(\beta)\land\forall\gamma<\beta\neg\varphi(\gamma)$, which is $Bool(\Sigma_1(L_{\rho_0}))$ by Π_0-Collection. Hence X is a set in L_{ρ_0}.

Define recursively ordinals $\{x_n\}_n$ as follows. $x_0=\alpha+1$, and x_{n+1} is defined to be the least ordinal x_{n+1} such that $\mathrm{Hull}(x_n)\cap Ord\subset x_{n+1}$, i.e., $(x_n,x_{n+1})\in X$. We see inductively that such an ordinal x_n exists. Moreover $n\mapsto x_n$ is a Δ_1-map. Then $x=\sup_n x_n<\rho_0$ is a desired one. □

Next let us interpret the set theory $T(\omega_1)$ in a theory $T^{ord}(\omega_1)$ of ordinals as in [3]. The base language is $\mathcal{L}_0=\{<,0,+,\lambda x.\omega^x\}$. Each of functions $1,\cdot,\max$ and the Gödel pairing function j is Δ_0-definable in $\mathcal{L}_0$, cf. Appendix B of [3]. For each bounded formula $\mathcal{A}(X,a,b)$ in the base language $\mathcal{L}_0$, introduce a binary predicate symbol $R^{\mathcal{A}}$ with its defining axiom $b\in R^{\mathcal{A}}_a:\equiv R^{\mathcal{A}}(a,b)\leftrightarrow\mathcal{A}(R^{\mathcal{A}}_{<a},a,b)$ where $c\in R^{\mathcal{A}}_{<a}:\Leftrightarrow\exists d<a(c\in R^{\mathcal{A}}_d)$. $\mathcal{L}_1$ denotes the resulting language with these predicates $R^{\mathcal{A}}$. Each epsilon number α is identified with the $\mathcal{L}_1$-structure $\langle\alpha;<,0,+,\lambda x.\omega^x,R^{\mathcal{A}}\rangle$.

$\mathsf{KP}\omega+(V=L)$ is interpretable in a theory T_2 with the axiom for Π_2-reflection, cf. Appendix A of [3]. For Π_2-formula A in the language $\mathcal{L}_1$,

$$A(t)\to\exists y[t<y\land A^{(y)}(t)]$$

is an instance of Π_2-reflection, which follows from $(V=L)$ and Δ_0-Collection.

The language of the theory $T^{ord}(\omega_1)$ is defined to be $\mathcal{L}_2=\mathcal{L}_1\cup\{\omega_1,P,P_{\rho_0}\}$. The axiom (1) is translated to

$$P(x,y)\to a<x\to\varphi[\omega_1,a]\to\varphi^y[x,a] \tag{5}$$

for Σ_1-formulas φ in $\mathcal{L}_1$. The axiom (2) becomes

$$a<\omega_1\to\exists x,y<\omega_1[a<x\land P(x,y)] \tag{6}$$

The axiom (3) turns to

$$P_{\rho_0}(x) \to a < x \to \varphi[a] \to \varphi^x[a] \tag{7}$$

The axiom (4) is formulated in

$$\exists x[a < x \land P_{\rho_0}(x)] \tag{8}$$

Finally consider Π_1-Collection. For a Δ_0-formula $\theta(u, v, w)$ in the language $\{\in\}$, let $\tau(x, u, v) \equiv [u, v \in L_x \land \forall w \in L_x \theta(u, v, w)]$. Then we see $\forall w\, \theta(u, v, w) \leftrightarrow \exists x \in P_{\rho_0} \tau(x, u, v)$ from $(V = L)$, (3) and (4). Hence Π_1-Collection

$$\forall u \in a \exists v \forall w\, \theta \to \exists c[a \in c \land \forall u \in a \exists v \in c \forall w\, \theta] \text{ (c is transitive)}$$

follows from

$$\forall u \in a\, A(u) \to \exists c[a \in c \land \forall u \in a\, A^{(c)}(u)]$$

where $A(u) \equiv (\exists x \in P_{\rho_0} \exists v\, \tau(x, u, v))$ for $A^{(c)}(u) \equiv (\exists x \in P_{\rho_0} \cap c \exists v \in c\, \tau)$. The latter is translated in the language $\mathcal{L}_2$ to

$$\forall u < a\, A(u) \to \exists c > a \forall u < a\, A^{(c)}(u) \tag{9}$$

where $A(u) \equiv (\exists x \in P_{\rho_0} \exists v\, \tau(x, u, v))$ with a Δ_0-formula τ in $\mathcal{L}_1$.

Let $\mathrm{T}^{ord}(\omega_1)$ denote the resulting extension of the theory T_2 of ordinals with axioms (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9), in which $\mathrm{T}(\omega_1)$ is interpreted.

4 Ordinals for ω_1

Let Ord^ε and $<^\varepsilon$ be Δ-predicates on the universe V such that for any transitive and wellfounded model V of $\mathsf{KP}\omega$, $<^\varepsilon$ is a well ordering of type ε_{ρ_0+1} on Ord^ε for the order type ρ_0 of the class Ord in V. $<^\varepsilon$ is seen to be a canonical ordering as stated in the following Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.1 *1. $\mathsf{KP}\omega$ proves the fact that $<^\varepsilon$ is a linear ordering.*

2. For any formula φ and each $n < \omega$,

$$\mathsf{KP}\omega \vdash \forall x \in Ord^\varepsilon(\forall y <^\varepsilon x\, \varphi(y) \to \varphi(x)) \to \forall x <^\varepsilon \omega_n(\rho_0 + 1)\varphi(x) \tag{10}$$

For simplicity let us identify the code $x \in Ord^\varepsilon$ with the 'ordinal' coded by x, and $<^\varepsilon$ is denoted by $<$ when no confusion likely occurs. Note that the ordinal ρ_0 is the order type of the class of ordinals in the intended model L_{ρ_0} of T_1. Define simultaneously the classes $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(X) \subset L_{\rho_0} \cup \varepsilon_{\rho_0+1}$ and the ordinals $\Psi_{\omega_1}(\alpha)$ and $\Psi_{\rho_0}(\alpha)$ for $\alpha <^\varepsilon \varepsilon_{\rho_0+1}$ and sets $X \subset L_{\omega_1}$ as follows. We see that $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$ and $\Psi_\kappa(\alpha)\, (\kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\})$ are (first-order) definable as a fixed point in T_1.

For $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\rho_0}$, Recall that $\mathrm{Hull}(X) \subset L_{\rho_0}$ and $F_X : \mathrm{Hull}(X) \leftrightarrow L_\gamma$ for $X \subset L_{\rho_0}$ and a $\gamma = F_X(\rho_0) \leq \rho_0$.

Definition 4.2 *$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$ is the Skolem hull of $\{0, \omega_1, \rho_0\} \cup X$ under the functions $+, \alpha \mapsto \omega^\alpha, \Psi_{\omega_1} \restriction \alpha, \Psi_{\rho_0} \restriction \alpha$, the Σ_1-definability, and the Mostowski collapsing functions $(x, d) \mapsto F_{x \cup \{\omega_1\}}(d)$ (Hull$(x \cup \{\omega_1\}) \cap \omega_1 \subset x$) and $d \mapsto F_x(d)$ (Hull$(x) \cap \rho_0 \subset x$).*

1. *$\{0, \omega_1, \rho_0\} \cup X \subset \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$.*
2. *$x, y \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X) \Rightarrow x + y, \omega^x \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$.*
3. *$\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X) \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \Psi_\kappa(\gamma) \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$ for $\kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\}$.*
4. *Hull$(\mathcal{H}_\alpha(X) \cap L_{\rho_0}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$.*

   Namely for any Σ_1-formula $\varphi[x, \vec{y}]$ in the language $\{\in\}$ and parameters $\vec{a} \subset \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X) \cap L_{\rho_0}$, if $b \in L_{\rho_0}$,
5. *If $x \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X) \cap \omega_1$ with Hull$(x \cup \{\omega_1\}) \cap \omega_1 \subset x$, and $d \in ($Hull$(x \cup \{\omega_1\}) \cap \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)) \cup \{\rho_0\}$, then $F_{x \cup \{\omega_1\}}(d) \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$.*
6. *If $x \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X) \cap \rho_0$ with Hull$(x) \cap \rho_0 \subset x$, and $d \in$ Hull$(x) \cap \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$, then $F_x(d) \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$.*

For $\kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\}$ and $\alpha < \varepsilon_{\rho_0+1}$

$$\Psi_\kappa(\alpha) := \min\{\beta \leq \kappa : \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) \cap \kappa \subset \beta\}.$$

The ordinal $\Psi_\kappa(\alpha)$ is well defined and $\Psi_\kappa(\alpha) \leq \kappa$ for $\kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\}$.

Proposition 4.3 *Both of $x = \mathcal{H}_\alpha(X)$ and $y = \Psi_\kappa(\alpha)$ $(\kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\})$ are Σ_2-predicates as fixed points in $\mathsf{KP}\omega$.*

Lemma 4.4 *For each $n < \omega$,*

$$T_1 \vdash \forall \alpha < \omega_{n+1}(\rho_0 + 1) \forall \kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\} \exists x < \kappa [x = \Psi_\kappa(\alpha)].$$

Proof. Let $\kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\}$. By Proposition 4.3 both $x = \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta)$ and $y = \Psi_\kappa(\alpha)$ are Σ_2-predicates. We show that $A(\alpha) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \beta < \rho_0 \exists x [x = \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta)] \wedge \forall \kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\} \exists \beta < \kappa [\Psi_\kappa(\alpha) = \beta]$ is progressive. Then $\forall \alpha < \omega_{n+1}(\rho_0 + 1) \forall \kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\} \exists x < \kappa [x = \Psi_\kappa(\alpha)]$ will follow from transfinite induction up to $\omega_{n+1}(\rho_0 + 1)$, cf. (10) in Proposition 4.1.

Assume $\forall \gamma < \alpha\, A(\gamma)$ as our induction hypothesis. Since $dom(h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1})$ is a Σ_1-subset of $\omega \times \beta$ for $\beta < \rho_0$, it is a set by Σ_1-Separation. Then so is the image Hull(β) of the Δ_1-map $h^{\rho_0}_{\Sigma_1}$. Hence $\forall \beta < \rho_0 \exists h [h = \text{Hull}(\beta)]$.

We see from this, the induction hypothesis and Σ_2-Collection that $\forall \beta < \rho_0 \exists x [x = \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) = \bigcup_m \mathcal{H}^m_\alpha(\beta)]$, where $\mathcal{H}^m_\alpha(\beta)$ is an m-th stage of the construction of $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta)$ such that $x = \mathcal{H}^m_\alpha(\beta)$ is a Σ_2-predicate.

Define recursively ordinals $\{\beta_m\}_m$ for $\kappa \in \{\omega_1, \rho_0\}$ as follows. Let $\beta_0 = 0$. β_{m+1} is defined to be the least ordinal $\beta_{m+1} \leq \kappa$ such that $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta_m) \cap \kappa \subset \beta_{m+1}$.

We see inductively that $\beta_m < \kappa$ using the regularity of κ and the facts that $\forall \beta < \kappa \exists x [x = \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) \wedge card(x) < \kappa]$, where $card(x) < \kappa$ designates that there exists a surjection $f : \gamma \to x$ for a $\gamma < \kappa$ and $f \in L_{\rho_0}$. Moreover $m \mapsto \beta_m$ is a Σ_2-map. Therefore $\beta = \sup_m \beta_m < \kappa$ enjoys $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\beta) \cap \kappa \subset \beta$. □

5 Hydras

In this section the sets of hydras a and their responses $a[z]$ to Hercules' chop are introduced. From these a hydra game is defined through well-behaved hydras defined in Definition 5.5, and the main theorem 5.9 is stated. It turns out that the game is well-defined in the theory T_1, cf. Proposition 5.6.2.

Each *hydra* is a term over symbols

$$\{0, +, \omega, \oplus, D_0, D_1, D_2, F\} \cup \{\cdot\} \cup \mathcal{F}_\mu$$

where 0 is a constant, each of ω, D_0, D_1, D_2, F is a unary function symbol, $+$ a function symbol for branching and $\cdot$ a binary function symbol. $\oplus$ is a punctuation mark. In a hydra $(a_1 + \cdots + a_n) \oplus b$, each a_i is a 'stack' of hydras available for b, which is needed to define well-behaved hydras in Definition 5.5. $f_A(y; x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ is an $(1+n)$-ary function symbol for Δ_0-formula $A(x; x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in the language $\mathcal{L}_1$.

We sometimes write ω^a for $D_2(a)$ with $a \neq 0$, where ω^a denotes a fixed point free version of the exponential function $a \mapsto \omega^a$ on ordinals a. For $a \neq 0$, $D_0(a), D_1(a)$ denote collapsing functions $\Psi_{\omega_1}(a), \Psi_{\rho_0}(a)$, resp. defined in section 4, while $1 := D_0(0)$, $\omega_1 := D_1(0)$, and $\rho_0 := D_2(0)$. f_A is a bounded μ-operators for Δ_0-formulas A on $\mathcal{L}_1$-structure ρ_0:

$$\begin{aligned} & f_A(y; x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \mu x < y. A(x; x_1, \ldots, x_n) \\ = & \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \min\{d < y : A(d; x_1, \ldots, x_n)\} & \text{if } \rho_0 \models \exists x < y\, A(x; x_1, \ldots, x_n) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{f_A\}_A \subset \mathcal{F}_\mu$ be a finite set of function symbols. In the following Definition 5.1, the set $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ of hydras over $\mathcal{F}_0$ and the set $Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$ of terms over function symbols in $\{+, \lambda x.\omega^x, F\} \cup \mathcal{F}_0$ are defined simultaneously. It is clear that both of these sets are computable subsets of integers. Furthermore subsets $\mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0), \mathcal{D}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)\,(i = 0, 1)$ of $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ and the *size* $|t| < \omega$ of terms $t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$, the *value* $v(a) < \varepsilon_{\rho_0+1}$ of hydras and terms $a \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0) \cup Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$, and finite sets $M_i(a), G_i(a)\,(i = 0, 1)$ are defined. For hydras $a \in \mathcal{D}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$, its local stack $stk(a)$ is also defined.

Definition 5.1 (Simultaneous inductive definition of $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ and $Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$.)

1. $\mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0) \subset \mathcal{H}_1(\mathcal{F}_0) \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0) \cap Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$ and $\mathcal{D}_i(\mathcal{F}_0) \subset \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for $i = 0, 1$.
2. $\{0\} \cup \{D_i(0) : i = 0, 1, 2\} \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$. $\{0, D_0(0)\} \subset \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$ and $D_1(0) \in \mathcal{H}_1(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

   $|0| = |D_i(0)| = 1$. $v(0) = 0$, $v(D_0(0)) = 1$, $v(D_1(0)) = \omega_1$, $v(D_2(0)) = \rho_0$. $M_j(0) = M_j(D_i(0)) = G_j(0) = G_j(D_i(0)) = \emptyset$ for $j = 0, 1$ and $i = 0, 1, 2$.
3. $0 \notin \{a_0, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)[\subset Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)]\,(n > 0) \Rightarrow (a_0 + \cdots + a_n) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)[\in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$, resp.

   $(a_0 + \cdots + a_n) \in \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0) \Leftrightarrow \{a_0, \ldots, a_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for $i = 0, 1$.

$|a_0 + \cdots + a_n| = \sum\{|a_k| : k \leq n\}$.

$v(a_0 + \cdots + a_n) = v(a_0)\# \cdots \# v(a_n)$ for the natural sum $\#$ on ordinals.

$G_i(a_0 + \cdots + a_n) = \bigcup\{G_i(a_k) : k \leq n\}$ and $M_i(a_0 + \cdots + a_n) = \bigcup\{M_i(a_k) : k \leq n\}$.

4. $0 \neq n < \omega, 0 \neq t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0) \cup \{D_2(0)\} \Rightarrow n \cdot t \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$, where $n = \underbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}_{n's\,1} \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

   $|n \cdot t| = |n| + |t|$ with $|n| = n$. $v(n \cdot t) = n \cdot v(t)$. $M_i(n \cdot t) = \{t\}$. $G_i(n \cdot t) = \emptyset$.

5. $0 \neq a \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0) \Rightarrow D_2(a) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$. $D_2(a) \in \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0) \Leftrightarrow a \in \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

   $|D_2(a)| = |a| + 1$. $v(D_2(a)) = \omega^{v(a)}$. $G_i(D_2(a)) = G_i(a)$. $M_i(D_2(a)) = M_i(a)$.

6. *(a)* Let b be a finite list $(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ of hydras b_i in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}_0)$. Then for $a \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$, $D_i(b \oplus a) \in \mathcal{D}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for $i = 0, 1$, and $F(b \oplus a) \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

   (b) When $b = \emptyset$(empty list), $\emptyset \oplus a$ is denoted a, and $D_v(a) \in \mathcal{D}_v(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for $v = 0, 1$.

   $|D_v(b \oplus a)| = |F(b \oplus a)| = 1 + |a| + \sum\{|b_i| : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$.

   $v(D_0(b \oplus a)) = \Psi_{\omega_1}(v(b \oplus a))$, $v(D_1(b \oplus a)) = \Psi_{\rho_0}(v(b \oplus a))$ with $v(b \oplus a) = v(b_1)\# \cdots \# v(b_n) \# \omega^{v(a)}$, and $v(F(b \oplus a)) = F_{x \cup \{\omega_1\}}(\rho_0)$ for $x = v(D_0(b \oplus a))$.

   $$G_i(D_v(b \oplus a)) = \begin{cases} \{b \oplus a\} \cup G_i(b_1) \cup \cdots \cup G_i(b_n) \cup G_i(a) & \text{if } i \leq v \\ \emptyset & \text{if } i > v \end{cases}$$

   $$M_i(D_v(b \oplus a)) = \begin{cases} M_i(b_1) \cup \cdots \cup M_i(b_n) \cup M_i(a) & \text{if } i \leq v \\ \emptyset & \text{if } i > v \end{cases}$$

   $stk(D_v(b \oplus a)) = b$.

7. $t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0) \Rightarrow \omega^t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$. $|\omega^t| = |t| + 1$. $v(\omega^t) = \omega^{v(t)}$. $G_i(\omega^t) = G_i(t)$. $M_i(\omega^t) = M_i(t)$.

8. For $f_A \in \mathcal{F}_0$, if $\{t, t_1, \ldots, t_n\} \subset Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$, then $f_A(t; t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$, and $f_A(t; t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in Tm_{\mu}^{\omega_1}(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

   $|f_A(t; t_1, \ldots, t_n)| = |f_A^{\omega_1}(t; t_1, \ldots, t_n)| = 1 + |t| + \sum\{|t_i| : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$.

   $$v(f_A(t; t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = \mu x < v(t).A(x; v(t_1), \ldots, v(t_n))$$

   $G_i(f_A(t; t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = G_i(t) \cup G_i(t_1) \cup \cdots \cup G_i(t_n)$.

   $M_i(f_A(t; t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = M_i(t) \cup M_i(t_1) \cup \cdots \cup M_i(t_n)$.

Note that $v(a) < \rho_0$ for any $a \in \mathcal{H}_1(\mathcal{F}_0) \cup Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$, and $v(a) < \omega_1$ for any $a \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

Proposition 5.2 *T_1 proves the following facts: $a < b :\Leftrightarrow v(a) < v(b)$ is a linear ordering on quotient sets of hydras by the equivalence relation $a \simeq b :\Leftrightarrow v(a) = v(b)$.*

Proof. This is seen from Proposition 4.3. □

By Proposition 5.2 let us identify the hydras a with the ordinals $v(a)$.

Definition 5.3 For terms $t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0) \cup \{D_2(0)\}$, and sets $c, c_0, c_1 \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0) & := & \{s : s \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0), v(s) < v(t)\} \\ multi_{t,i}(c; \mathcal{F}_0) & := & \{s \in multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0) : v(s) \in \mathcal{H}_{v(c)}(v(D_i(c\oplus)))\}] \, (i = 0, 1) \\ multi_{t,0,n}(c; \mathcal{F}_0) & := & \{s \in multi_{t,0}(c; \mathcal{F}_0) : |s| \leq 2^{2^n}\} \\ multi_{t,0,n}(c_0, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0) & := & multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0) \cap multi_{t,0,n}(c_0; \mathcal{F}_0) \end{array}$$

where $v(D_1(c\oplus)) = \Psi_{\rho_0}(v(c))$ and $v(D_0(c\oplus)) = \Psi_{\omega_1}(v(c))$. We write $D_i(c)$ for $D_i(c\oplus)$.

Definition 5.4 Let $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_\mu$ be a finite set of function symbols. Let $a \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ be a hydra. Its *domain* $dom(a)$ and hydras $a[z] \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ are defined for $z \in dom(a)$.

$dom(a)$ is one of sets $\emptyset(= 0), 1(= \{0\}), \omega, \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$ $(i = 0, 1)$ or one of sets $multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0), multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$ for a term $t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0) \cup \{D_2(0)\}$ with $v(t) \neq 0$, and some sets $c_1 \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

([ ].1) *$dom(0) = \emptyset$.*

([ ].2) *$dom(1) = 1$, $1[0] = 0$* where *$1 = D_0(0)$.*

([ ].3) *$dom(D_{i+1}(0)) = \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$; $(D_{i+1}(0))[z] = z$* for *$i = 0, 1$.*

([ ].4) Let *$m > 0$* and *$0 \neq t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0) \cup \{D_2(0)\}$. $dom(m \cdot t) = multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0)$; $(m \cdot t)[s] = (m \cdot s) + (m - 1)$,* where *$(m \cdot 0) + b := b$.*

([ ].5) Let *$a = D_i(b)$,* where *b* is a non-zero hydra.

([ ].5.1) If *$b = b_0 + 1$,* then *$dom(a) = \omega$; $a[n] = (D_i(b_0)) \cdot 2 := D_i(b_0) + D_i(b_0)$* for *$n \in \omega$.*

([ ].5.2) If either *$dom(b) \in \{\omega, \mathcal{H}_j(\mathcal{F}_0) : j < i\}$* or *$dom(b) \in \{multi_{t,1}(c; \mathcal{F}_0) : t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0), c \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)\}$* and *$i = 1$,* then *$dom(a) = dom(b)$; $a[z] = D_i(b[z])$* for *$z \in dom(b)$.*

In what follows let $b = c_i \oplus b_0$ with $stk(D_i(b)) = c_i$ and $b_0 \neq 0$.

([ ].5.3) If *$dom(b) \in \{\mathcal{H}_j(\mathcal{F}_0) : j \geq i\}$,* then *$dom(a) = \omega$.* Let *$\ell = D_i(c_i \oplus b_0[1])$* and *$r = D_i((c_i + \omega^{b_0[1]} + 1) \oplus b_0[1])$* with *$stk(r) = c_i + D_2(b_0[1]) + 1$, $a[n] := \ell + r$* if *$i = 1$. $a[n] := r$* if *$i = 0$,* where *$c_i + D_2(b_0[1]) + 1 := c_i * \langle D_2(b_0[1]), 1\rangle$,* a concatenated list.

([ ].5.4) If $dom(b) = multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for a term t and $i = 1$, then $(D_1(b))[s] = D_1(b[s])$ for $s \in dom(D_1(b)) = multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$.

([ ].5.5) If $dom(b) \in \{multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0), multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0) : t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0), c_1 \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)\}$ and $i = 0$, then $dom(D_0(b)) = \omega$. Let $multi_n = multi_{t,0,n}(c_0, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$ when $dom(b) = multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$. Otherwise $multi_n = multi_{t,0,n}(c_0; \mathcal{F}_0)$. Then $a[n] := D_0(c_0 \oplus b_0[s_n])$ where s_n is a term in the set $multi_n$ such that $v(s_n) = \max(\{0\} \cup \{v(s) : s \in multi_n\})$.

([ ].6) Let $a = (a_0 + \cdots + a_k)$ $(k > 0)$, where each a_i is a non-zero hydra. Then $dom(a) = dom(a_k)$; $a[z] = (a_0 + \cdots + a_{k-1} + a_k[z])$.

Note that in the case $dom(a) = \omega$, $a[n]$ depends on n only in the case **([ ].5.5)**.

The term t of $m \cdot t$ in the case **([ ].4)** is regarded as the rightmost head of the hydra $m \cdot t$. When Hercules chops off the head, the hydra chooses a term s from a (possibly) *infinite* set $multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0)$, and $m \cdot t$ turns to $m \cdot s + (m-1)$. When the t is the rightmost head in a hydra $a = D_0(c_0 \oplus b_1[\cdots D_1(c_1 \oplus b_0[\cdots m \cdot t])])$, the hydra a builds a term s from constants $0, 1, \omega_1$ and a finite number of function symbols in $\{+, \lambda x.\omega^x, D_0, D_1, D_2, F\} \cup \mathcal{F}_0$. Moreover the hydra obeys the restrictions $s \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1 \oplus)) \cap \mathcal{H}_{c_0}(D_0(c_0 \oplus))$ and $|s| \leq 2^{2^n}$. In particular the hydra has to choose a term s from the *finite* set $multi_{t,0,n}(c_0, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$, and the hydra turns to $a[n] = D_0(c_0 \oplus b_1[\cdots D_1(c_1 \oplus b_0[\cdots (m \cdot s + (m-1))])])$, cf. **([ ].5.5)**.

Note that we have $multi_{s,2}(\mathcal{F}_0) = multi_{s',2}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ when $v(s) = v(s')$. This means that it does not matter which maximal term s_n is chosen from the finite set $multi_{t,0,n}(c_0, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$ in the Hydra games in Definition 5.8.

It is easy to see by induction on $|a|$ that

$$M_i(a) \subset \mathcal{H}_c(D_i(c)) \,\&\, G_i(a) < c \Rightarrow a \in \mathcal{H}_c(D_i(c)) \tag{11}$$

Definition 5.5 A hydra b is said to be *well-behaved* if every D-subhydra $D_i(c_i \oplus a)$ of b enjoys the following condition.

$$G_i(c_i \oplus a) < c_i,\ \forall b \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)[M_i(c_i) \subset \mathcal{H}_{c_i}(D_i(c_i \oplus b))], M_i(a) \subset \mathcal{H}_{c_i}(D_i(c_i)) \tag{12}$$

Note that any multiplicative hydra $m \cdot t$ is well-behaved since there is no D-subhydra of $m \cdot t$.

Proposition 5.6 *T_1 proves the following facts.*

1. *For $a \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$, $dom(a) \in \{0, 1, \omega\}$ and $n \in dom(a)$, $a[n] \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$ and $|a[n]| \leq \max\{2|a| + 2^{2^n}, 3|a|\}$.*
2. *For any hydra a and any $z \in dom(a)$, $\exists! b \in \mathcal{H}(b = a[z])$.*

Proof. 5.6.1. Let $a = m \cdot t$ and $a[s] = m \cdot s + (m-1)$ for an s such that $|s| \leq 2^{2^n}$. Then $|a[s]| \leq 2m + 2^{2^n} \leq 2|a| + 2^{2^n}$. Let $a = D_1(c_1 \oplus b)$ with $dom(b) = \mathcal{H}_1(\mathcal{F}_0)$. Then $a[n] = \ell + r$ for $\ell = D_1(c_1 \oplus b[1])$ and $r = D_1((c_1 + D_2(b[1]) + 1) \oplus b[1])$, and $|a[n]| = |\ell| + |r| \leq |a| + 2|a|$.
5.6.2. This is seen from Proposition 5.2. □

Lemma 5.7 *T_1 proves the following facts: Let $a \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ be a well-behaved hydra and $z \in dom(a)$ such that z is well-behaved if $dom(a) \neq multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0), multi_{t,1}(c; \mathcal{F}_0)$. Then $a[z]$ is well-behaved and $a[z] < a$.*

Proof. By induction on the sizes $|a|$ of hydras a. Let a be a well-behaved hydra. Consider the case when $a = D_v(c \oplus b)$ with $b \neq 0$.

([ ].5.1) If $b = b_0 + 1$, then $a[n] = D_v(c \oplus b_0) \cdot 2$, where $D_v(c \oplus b_0)$ is well-behaved since $G_v(b_0) = G_v(b_0 + 1)$ and $M_v(b_0) = M_v(b_0 + 1)$.

([ ].5.2) If $dom(a) = dom(b)$, then $a[z] = D_v(c \oplus b[z])$. By IH $b[z]$ is well-behaved and $b[z] < b$. We have $G_v(b[z]) \subset G_v(b)$ by $G_v(z) = \emptyset$. If either $dom(b) = \omega$ or $dom(b) = \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)\,\&\, v = 1$, then $M_v(b[z]) \subset M_v(b)$, and $a[z]$ is well-behaved. Let $dom(b) = multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0) \ni z$ and $v = 1$. Then $b = b[D_1(c_1 \oplus b_0[m \cdot t])]$ for some b_0 with $dom(b_0) = multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ and $m < \omega$. We have $z \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1))$, and $M_v(b[z]) \subset M_v(b) \cup M_v(m \cdot z) = M_v(b) \cup \{z\}$. On the other hand we have $c_1 < c_1 \oplus b_0 \in G_1(b) < c$ and $D_1(c_1) < D_1(c)$ by $c_1 \in \mathcal{H}_c(D_1(c))$. Hence $z \in \mathcal{H}_c(D_v(c))$, and $a[z]$ is well-behaved.

From (11), $G_v(c \oplus b[z]) < c$, $M_v(c \oplus b[z]) \subset \mathcal{H}_c(D_1(c))$ and $c \in \mathcal{H}_c(D_v(c \oplus b))$ we see that $c \oplus b[z] \in \mathcal{H}_c(D_v(c \oplus b))$. Hence we obtain $a[z] < a$ by $b[z] < b$.

([ ].5.3) If $dom(b) = \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$ with $i \geq v$, then $a = D_v(c \oplus b[D_{i+1}(0)])$ and $a[n] \in \{\ell + r, r\}$ for $n = z \in dom(a) = \omega$, $\ell = D_v(c \oplus b[1])$ and $r = D_v((c + D_2(b[1]) + 1) \oplus b[1])$. By IH $b[1]$ is well-behaved. We see that $G_v((c + D_2(b[1]) + 1) \oplus b[1]) \subset G_v(c \oplus b) < c < 1\#c$, $M_v(b[1]) \subset M_v(b)$ and $M_v(c + D_2(b[1]) + 1) = M_v(c \oplus b[1]) \subset \mathcal{H}_c(D_v(1 + c + d))$ for any d. Hence $a[n]$ is well-behaved. It is clear that $v(c)\#\omega^{v(b[1])} \cdot 2 + 1 = v((c + D_2(b[1]) + 1) \oplus b[1]) < v(c \oplus b) = v(c)\#\omega^{v(b)}$ by $b[1] < b$, and $a[n] < a$.

([ ].5.4) If $dom(b) = multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ and $v = 1$, then $a[z] = D_1(c \oplus b[z])$ for $z \in multi_{t,1}(c; \mathcal{F}_0)$. By IH $b[z]$ is well-behaved and $b[z] < b$. We have $G_1(b[z]) \subset G_1(b)$ and $M_1(b[z]) \subset M_1(b) \cup \{z\}$. From $z \in multi_{t,1}(c; \mathcal{F}_0)$ we see $z \in \mathcal{H}_c(D_1(c))$, and hence $a[z]$ is well-behaved. Also $a[z] < a$ follows from $b[z] < b$ as in the case $dom(b) = \omega, \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

([ ].5.5) Finally let $dom(b) = multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0), multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$ and $v = 0$. This means that $b = b[m \cdot t]$ or $b = b[D_1(c_1 \oplus b_0[m \cdot t])]$ for some b_0 and m such that $dom(b_0) = multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0)$. Let $multi_n$ denote the set $multi_{t,0,n}(c, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$ when $dom(b) = multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$. Otherwise let $multi_n = multi_{t,0,n}(c; \mathcal{F}_0)$. Then $n = z \in dom(a) = \omega$ and $a[n] = D_0(c \oplus b[s_n])$ for a term $s_n \in multi_n$, where $b[s_n] = b[(m \cdot t)[s_n]]$ or $b[s_n] = b[D_1(c_1 \oplus b_0[(m \cdot t)[s_n]])]$ with $(m \cdot t)[s_n] = m \cdot s_n + (m - 1)$.

From IH we see that $b[s_n]$ is well-behaved, $b_0[(m \cdot t)[s_n]] < b_0[m \cdot t]$ and $b[s_n] < b$. We have $M_0(b[s_n]) \subset M_0(b) \cup \{s_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}_c(D_0(c))$ by $s_n \in$

$multi_{t,0,n}(c;\mathcal{F}_0)$. If $dom(b) = multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0)$, then $G_0(c \oplus b[s_n]) \subset G_0(c \oplus b)$. If $dom(b) = multi_{t,1}(c_1;\mathcal{F}_0)$, then $G_0(c \oplus b[s_n]) \subset G_0(c \oplus b) \cup \{c_1 \oplus b_0[(m \cdot t)[s_n]]\} \leq G_0(c \oplus b) < c$ by $c_1 \oplus b_0[(m \cdot t)[s_n]] < c_1 \oplus b_0[m \cdot t] \in G_0(b) < c$. Hence $a[n]$ is well-behaved.

We have $G_0(c \oplus b[s_n]) < c$, $M_0(c \oplus b[s_n]) \subset \mathcal{H}_c(D_0(c))$ and $c \in \mathcal{H}_c(D_0(c \oplus b))$. We obtain $c \oplus b[s_n] \in \mathcal{H}_c(D_0(c \oplus b)$ by (11). Hence $a[n] < a$ by $b[s_n] < b$.

□

When $dom(a) = 1$, let $a[n] := a[0]$ for any $n \in \omega$.

Definition 5.8 (Hydra games (battles))
Let $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_\mu$ be a finite set of function symbols. Let $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$ be a given hydra over $\mathcal{F}_0$. Define hydras $a_n \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$ over $\mathcal{F}_0$ recursively as follows.

1. If $a_n = 0$, then $a_{n+1} = 0$.

   In what follows assume $a_n \neq 0$.

2. $a_{n+1} = a_n[n]$ where the RHS is determined from $\mathcal{F}_0$.

Let $(\mathrm{H})_{\omega_1}$ denote the statement saying that

> for any finite set $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_\mu$ of function symbols, and any *well-behaved* $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$, there exists an $n < \omega$ such that $a_n = 0$.

Theorem 5.9 *1. T_1 proves the statement $(\mathrm{H})_{\omega_1}$ for* each *hydra $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$.*

2. T_1 does not prove the statement $(\mathrm{H})_{\omega_1}$.

Proof. Theorem 5.9.1 is seen from Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 5.7.

Theorem 5.9.2 follows from a ‘consistency proof’, i.e., from the following Lemma 5.10. Note that the statement $(\mathrm{H})_{\omega_1}$ is of the form $\forall m \exists n\, R(m,n)$ for a Π_2-predicate R with codes$\in \omega$ of hydras since $b = a[n]$ is Π_2. □

Lemma 5.10

$$T_1 \vdash (\mathrm{H})_{\omega_1} \to \mathrm{CON}(T_1)$$

for a standard consistency statement $\mathrm{CON}(T_1)$ of the theory T_1.

Lemma 5.10 is shown in the next sections 6 and 7.

6 Finite proof figures

In this section an extension $T_c(\omega_1)$ of the theory $T^{ord}(\omega_1)$ with individual constants and function constants is formulated in one-sided sequent calculus, and permissible ordinal assignments to sequents occurring in proofs are defined in subsection 6.1. Each proof is shown to have a permissible ordinal assignment in subsection 6.2.

In this section 6 and the next section 7 we work in the theory $T(\omega_1)$.

The language $\mathcal{L}_c$ of $T_c(\omega_1)$ is obtained from $\mathcal{L}_2$ by adding names (individual constants) c_a of each ordinal $a = D_i(b)$ $(i = 0, 1, b \neq 0)$, names c_a of each ordinal $a = F_{x\cup\{\omega_1\}}(\rho_0)$ for $x = D_0(b) = \Psi_{\omega_1}(b)$, and 'function symbols' $f_A(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ for each Δ_0-formula $A(x; y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ in the language $\mathcal{L}_1$. The constant c_a is identified with the ordinal a. Formulas are assumed to be in negation normal form.

Hull(x) denotes the Σ_1-Skolem hull of sets x of ordinals on ρ_0, where ρ_0 is regarded as an $\mathcal{L}_1$-structure.

Definition 6.1 *Terms* in $\mathcal{L}_c$ are generated as follows.

1. Each variable and each constant $D_i(b), F_{x\cup\{\omega_1\}}(\rho_0)$ is a term.

2. If t is a term, then so is ω^t.

3. If $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ $(n > 1)$ are terms, then so is $t_1 + \cdots + t_n$.

4. For Δ_0-formula $A(x; y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ and *closed* terms $t_1, \ldots, t_n$, $\mu x.A(x; t_1, \ldots, t_n) \equiv f_A(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is a *closed* term.

$F_{x\cup\{\omega_1\}}(y)$ denotes the Mostowski collpase $F_{x\cup\{\omega_1\}}$: Hull$(x \cup \{\omega_1\}) \leftrightarrow \gamma$ with $x = F_{x\cup\{\omega_1\}}(\omega_1)$ and $\gamma = F_{x\cup\{\omega_1\}}(\rho_0)$.

Each term in $\mathcal{L}_c$ is a term in $Tm(\mathcal{F}_\mu)$.

Definition 6.2

1. A *literal* is one of atomic formulas $s < t, R^{\mathcal{A}}(s, t), P(t_0, t_1), P_{\rho_0}(t)$ or their negations.

2. The *truth* of closed literals is defined as follows. $s < t$ is *true* if $v(s) < v(t)$. $R^{\mathcal{A}}(s, t)$ is *true* if $R^{\mathcal{A}}(v(s), v(t))$ holds. $P(t_0, t_1)$ is *true* if $v(t_0) = x = \Psi_{\omega_1}(\beta)$ and $v(t_1) = F_{x\cup\{\omega_1\}}(\rho_0)$ for some β. $P_{\rho_0}(t)$ is *true* if $v(t) = \Psi_{\rho_0}(\beta)$ for some β. A closed literal $\neg L$ is *true* if L is not true.

3. An *E-formula* is either a literal or a formula of one of the shapes $A_0 \vee A_1, \exists x\, A(x)$.

The following are axioms and inference rules in $T_c(\omega_1)$. By Δ_0*-formula* we mean a bounded formula in the language $\mathcal{L}_\mu$ in which predicates P, P_{ρ_0} does not occur. A Σ_1*-formula* or a Π_1*-formula* is defined similarly. These formulas are obtained from formulas in $\mathcal{L}_1 \cup \{\omega_1\}$ by substituting $\mathcal{L}_c$-terms for variables.

[**Axioms**]

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, A}\ (ax)$$

where A is either a true closed literal or a true closed Δ_0-formula or a Δ_0-axiom whose universal closure is an axiom for the constants $0, <, +, \lambda x.\omega^x$.

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, \neg A, A}\ (taut) \qquad \text{for literals and } \Delta_0\text{-formulas } A.$$

This means $\mathrm{dp}(A) = 1$ in Definition 6.4 below.

Cf. (6).

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, (s \not< \omega_1,)\exists x, y < \omega_1 [s < x \land P(x, y)]}\ (P\exists)$$

When $s < \omega_1$ is a true literal, this may be absent.

Cf. (8).

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, \exists x [s < x \land P_{\rho_0}(x)]}\ (P_{\rho_0}\exists)$$

[**Inference rules**] In each case the main (principal) formula is assumed to be in the lower sequent Γ. Namely $(A_0 \lor A_1) \in \Gamma$ in $(\lor)$, $(A_0 \land A_1) \in \Gamma$ in $(\land)$, $(\exists x\, A(x)) \in \Gamma$ in $(\exists)$, $(\exists x < t\, A(x)) \in \Gamma$ in $(b\exists)$, $(\forall x\, A(x)) \in \Gamma$ in $(\forall)$, $(\forall x < t\, A(x)) \in \Gamma$ in $(b\forall)$.

The variable x in $(\forall), (b\forall)$ is an eigenvariable.

$$\frac{\Gamma, A_i}{\Gamma}\ (\lor) \qquad \frac{\Gamma, A_0 \quad \Gamma, A_1}{\Gamma}\ (\land)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A(s)}{\Gamma}\ (\exists) \quad \frac{\Gamma, A(s)}{(s \not< t,)\Gamma}\ (b\exists) \quad \frac{\Gamma, A(x)}{\Gamma}\ (\forall) \quad \frac{\Gamma, x \not< t, A(x)}{\Gamma}\ (b\forall)$$

where in $(b\exists)$, the formula $s \not< t$ may be absent when $s \not< t$ is a closed false literal.

$$\frac{\Gamma, \neg\forall x < y A(x), A(y) \quad \Gamma, \neg A(s)}{(s \not< t,)\Gamma}\ (ind)$$

where $s \not< t$ may be absent in the lower sequent when $s < t$ is a true closed formula. The term t is the *induction term* of the (ind). The variable y is the *eigenvariable* of the rule (ind).

$$\frac{\Gamma, \neg A \quad A, \Lambda}{\Gamma, \Lambda}\ (cut)$$

A is an E-formula called the *cut formula* of the (cut).

$$\frac{\Gamma, \forall x < t\, A(x) \quad t \not< y, \exists x < t\, \neg A^{(y)}(x), \Gamma}{\Gamma}\ (Rfl)$$

t is a term, y is an eigenvariable, and $A(x) \equiv (\exists z \in P_{\rho_0} \exists w\, B(x)) \equiv (\exists z [P_{\rho_0}(z) \land \exists w\, B(x)]\ (B \in \Delta_0)$, $A^{(y)}(x) :\equiv (\exists z \in P_{\rho_0} \cap y \exists w < y\, B) \equiv (\exists z < y [P_{\rho_0}(z) \land \exists w < y\, B(x)])$, cf. (9).

$$\frac{\Gamma, \varphi[\omega_1, s]}{\Gamma, (\neg P(t_0, t_1), s \not< t_0,)\varphi^{t_1}[t_0, s]}\ (P\Sigma_1)$$

φ is an arbitrary Σ_1-formula in the language $\mathcal{L}_1$ with predicates $R^{\mathcal{A}}$, cf. (5). When $P(t_0, t_1)$ or $s < t_0$ is a true literal, these may be absent.

$$\frac{\Gamma, \varphi[s]}{\Gamma, (\neg P_{\rho_0}(t), s \not< t,)\varphi^t[s]} \ (P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1)$$

φ is an arbitrary Σ_1-formula in the language $\mathcal{L}_1$, cf. (7). When $P_{\rho_0}(t)$ or $s < t$ is a true literal, these may be absent.

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, \Delta} \ (h)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \forall x < t\, A(x)}{\Gamma, \forall x < t\, A^{(\alpha)}(x)} \ (D_1)_\alpha \qquad \frac{\Gamma, \Lambda}{\Gamma, \Lambda^{(\alpha)}} \ (D_1)_\alpha$$

where t is a closed term with $v(t) < \alpha$, $A(x) \equiv (\exists z \in P_{\rho_0} \exists w\, B(x))\,(B \in \Delta_0)$, $A^{(y)}(x) :\equiv (\exists z \in P_{\rho_0} \cap y \exists w < y\, B)$ and $\alpha = D_1(c_1 \oplus \alpha_0)$ for some $c_1 \oplus \alpha_0 \neq 0$ with $c_1 = stk(\alpha)$. $\Gamma \cup \Lambda$ is a set of closed formulas in which no unbounded universal quantifier occurs.

$$\frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda} \ (D_0)_\alpha$$

where Λ is a set of false closed Δ_0-formulas, and $\alpha = D_0(c_0 \oplus \alpha_0)$ for some $c_0 \oplus \alpha_0 \neq 0$ with $c_0 = stk(\alpha)$.

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, \Delta} \ (pad)_b \qquad \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma, \Delta} \ {}_c(pad)$$

for $b, c \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

Proof figures are constructed from these axioms and inference rules.

6.1 Ordinal assignment

In this subsection let us define permissible ordinal assignments.

Definition 6.3 The *height* $h(\Gamma) = h(\Gamma; \mathcal{P}) < \omega \cdot 2$ of sequents Γ in a proof figure $\mathcal{P}$.

1. $h(\Gamma) = 0$ if Γ is the end-sequent of $\mathcal{P}$.
2. $h(\Gamma) = \omega \cdot i$ if Γ is the upper sequent of a (D_i).
3. $h(\Gamma) = h(\Delta) + 1$ if Γ is the upper sequent of an (h) with its lower sequent Δ.
4. $h(\Gamma) = h(\Delta)$ if Γ is an upper sequent of a rule other than (h) and (D_i) with its lower sequent Δ.

Let $h_0(\Gamma) = h(\Gamma)$ if $h(\Gamma) < \omega$. $h_0(\Gamma) = h(\Gamma) - \omega$ if $h(\Gamma) \geq \omega$.

Definition 6.4 The *depth* $\mathrm{dp}(A)$ of formulas A.

1. $\mathrm{dp}(A) = 1$ if A is either a literal or a Δ_0-formula.

   In what follows A is neither a literal nor a Δ_0-formula.

2. $\mathrm{dp}(A) = \max\{\mathrm{dp}(A_i) : i = 0, 1\} + 1$ if $A \equiv (A_0 \vee A_1), (A_0 \wedge A_1)$.
3. $\mathrm{dp}(A) = \mathrm{dp}(B) + 1$ if $A \equiv (\exists x\, B(x)), (\forall x\, B(x))$.
4. $\mathrm{dp}(A) = \mathrm{dp}(B) + 1$ if $A \equiv (\exists x < t\, B(x)), (\forall x < t\, B(x))$.

Definition 6.5 A proof figure is said to be *height regulated* if it enjoys the following conditions:

(h0) The end-sequent of $\mathcal{P}$ consists solely of closed false Δ_0-formulas.

(h1) There occurs no free variable in any sequent Γ if $h(\Gamma) < \omega$.

(h2) If a rule $(D_1)\, J_0$ is above another $(D_1)\, J_1$, then the only rules between J_0 and J_1 are (D_1)'s.

(h3) Let $\Gamma, \exists x[s < x \wedge P_{\rho_0}(x)]$ be an axiom $(P_{\rho_0}\exists)$ in $\mathcal{P}$, and J be a (cut) whose cut formula is a descendant $C \equiv (\exists x[s < x \wedge P_{\rho_0}(x)])$ of C in the axiom. Then $h(\Delta) \geq \omega$.

(h4) For any (cut) in $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathrm{dp}(C) \leq h_0(\Gamma, \Delta)$ for its cut formula C and the lower sequent Γ, Δ.

(h5) For any (ind) in $\mathcal{P}$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \neg\forall x < yA(x), A(y) \quad \Gamma, \neg A(s)}{(s \not< t,)\Gamma}\ (ind)$$

$\omega + \mathrm{dp}(\forall x < sA(x)) \leq h(s \not< t, \Gamma)$.

(h6) There exists a rule (D_1) below a (Rfl). Let J be the lowest such rule (D_1) with the lower sequent Δ. Then $h(\Delta) \geq \mathrm{dp}(\exists x < t\neg A^{(y)}(x))$.

$$\begin{array}{c} \dfrac{\Gamma, \forall x < t\, A(x) \quad t \not< y, \exists x < t\neg A^{(y)}(x), \Gamma}{\Gamma}\ (Rfl) \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots}{\Delta}\ (D_1)\, J \end{array}$$

Definition 6.6 Let n_0 be a positive integer, and $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_\mu$ a finite set of function symbols. An $(n_0, \mathcal{F}_0)$-*ordinal assignment* for a proof figure $\mathcal{P}$ attaches a *well-behaved* hydra (an ordinal) $o(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ to each occurrence of a sequent Γ in

$\mathcal{P}$ which enjoys the following conditions. Let us write when the lower sequent Γ receives an ordinal b, i.e., $o(\Gamma) = b$, and $o(\Gamma_i) = a_i$ for upper sequents Γ_i

$$\frac{\cdots \Gamma_i; a_i \cdots}{\Gamma; b}$$

Axioms Γ.

1. If Γ is one of axioms $(ax), (taut)$, then $0 \neq o(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$.
2. For a $(P_{\rho_0}\exists)\,\Gamma$, $o(\Gamma) = n_0 \cdot \rho_0 + \rho_0 \cdot m$ for $m \geq 1$, where $n_0 = \underbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}_{n_0\text{'s } 1}$ in $n_0 \cdot \rho_0 \in Tm$ and $\rho_0 \cdot m = \underbrace{\rho_0 + \cdots + \rho_0}_{m\text{'s } \rho_0}$.
3. For a $(P\exists)\,\Gamma$, $o(\Gamma) = \omega_1$.

Rules. Let Γ be the lower sequent of a rule J with its upper sequents Γ_i:

$$\frac{\cdots \Gamma_i \cdots}{\Gamma}\ J$$

1. J is one of the rules $(\forall), (P\Sigma_1), (P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1)$ or an implicit $(b\forall)$: $o(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma_0)$.
2. J is an explicit $(b\forall)$: $o(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma_0) + b$ for some $0 \neq b \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$. In this case the rule is denoted $(b\forall)_b$.
3. J is a $(\wedge)$: Then two upper sequents Γ_0, Γ_1 have to receive the same ordinal $o(\Gamma_0) = o(\Gamma_1)$, and $o(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma_0)$ if J is implicit. Otherwise $o(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma_0) + b$ for some $0 \neq b \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$. In this case the rule is denoted $(\wedge)_b$.
4. J is one of rules $(\vee), (\exists), (b\exists)$: $o(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma_0) + b$ for some $0 \neq b \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$. In this case the rule is denoted $(\vee)_b, (\exists)_b$, etc.
5. J is a $(pad)_b$: $o(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma_0) + b$ for $b \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$.
6. J is a ${}_b(pad)$: $o(\Gamma) = b + o(\Gamma_0)$ for $b \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$.
7. J is an (h): $o(\Gamma) = \omega^{o(\Gamma_0)} = D_2(o(\Gamma_0))$.
8. J is a (cut): $o(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma_0) + o(\Gamma_1)$.
9. J is a (Rfl): $o(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma_0) + \rho_0$ where $o(\Gamma_0) = o(\Gamma_1)$.
10. J is an (ind):

$$\frac{\Gamma, \neg\forall x < y A(x), A(y); a_0 \quad \Gamma, \neg A(s); a_1}{(s \not< t,)\Gamma; b}\ (ind)$$

Let $mj(t) = D_2(0)$ if t is not closed. Otherwise either $mj(t) = D_2(0)$ or $mj(t) = t'$ for some $t' \in Tm$ such that $v(t) \leq v(t')$.

If $\neg A(y)$ is an E-formula, $b = (a_0 + a_1 + 1) \cdot mj(t)$. Otherwise $b = (a_1 + a_0 + 1) \cdot mj(t)$, cf. **(p1)** below.

11. J is a rule (D_1): If J is a (D_1), then

$$o(\Gamma) = \begin{cases} D_1(c_1 \oplus o(\Gamma_0)) & \text{if } h(\Gamma) < \omega \\ o(\Gamma_0) & \text{if } h(\Gamma) = \omega \end{cases}$$

where $stk(o(\Gamma)) = c_1$.

12. J is a rule (D_0):

$$o(\Gamma) = D_0(c_0 \oplus o(\Gamma_0))$$

where $stk(o(\Gamma)) = c_0$.

Finally let $o(\mathcal{P}) = o(\Gamma_{end})$ for the end-sequent Γ_{end} of $\mathcal{P}$.

Note that by **(h2)**, there are rules (D_1) consecutively.

$$\begin{array}{c} \dfrac{\Gamma_n}{\Gamma_{n-1}}\ (D_1) \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\overline{\Gamma_1}}{\Gamma_0}\ (D_1) \end{array}$$

with $h(\Gamma_0) < \omega$. Then $o(\Gamma_1) = \cdots = o(\Gamma_n)$ and $o(\Gamma_0) = D_1(c \oplus o(\Gamma_1))$. We write $stk(o(\Gamma_i)) = c$ for any $i < n$.

Definition 6.7 Let $|x| = 1$ for the variables x.

For a proof $\mathcal{P}$ with an o.a. o, $|(\mathcal{P}, o)|$ denotes the maximum of $|o(\mathcal{P})|$ and $|t|$ for terms (possibly with variables) t occurring in $\mathcal{P}$.

Lemma 6.8 (Depth lemma)
For any formula $A(x)$, there exist ordinal assignments o such that

$$o(\Gamma, \neg A(t), A(t)) \in \{\mathrm{dp}(A(x)), \rho_0 \cdot \mathrm{dp}(A(x)), n \cdot \rho_0 + \rho_0 \cdot (\mathrm{dp}(A(x)) - 1) : n > 0\}$$

for any Γ and any term t.

Proof. By induction on $\mathrm{dp}(A)$. To get $o(\Gamma, \neg A(t), A(t)) = \mathrm{dp}(A(x))$, assign a positive integer to $(taut)$'s $\Gamma, \neg B, B$ and use $(\vee)_b, (\exists)_b$, etc. for $b = 1$. To get $o(\Gamma, \neg A(t), A(t)) = \rho_0 \cdot \mathrm{dp}(A(x))$, assign an ordinal $\rho_0 \cdot m\,(0 < m < \omega)$ to $(taut)$'s and use $(\vee)_b, (\exists)_b$, etc. for $b = \rho_0$. Finally to get $o(\Gamma, \neg A(t), A(t)) = n \cdot \rho_0 + \rho_0 \cdot (\mathrm{dp}(A(x)) - 1)$ for $n > 0$, assign $n \cdot \rho_0$ to $(taut)$'s and use $(\vee)_b, (\exists)_b$, etc. for some $b = \rho_0 \cdot m$. □

Definition 6.9 A pair $(\mathcal{P}, o)$ of a proof figure $\mathcal{P}$ and an $(n_0, \mathcal{F}_0)$-o.a. (ordinal assignment) $o : \Gamma \mapsto o(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ is a *proof with o.a.* (ordinal assignment) if the following conditions are met.

(p0) $\mathcal{P}$ is height regulated.

(p1) For any (ind) occurring in $\mathcal{P}$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \neg\forall x < y A(x), A(y); a_0 \quad \Gamma, \neg A(s); a_1}{(s \not< t,)\Gamma; a} \ (ind)$$

$\mathrm{dp}(A(y)) \leq a_1 < a_0 < \omega$.

(p2) **(p2.1)** Let t be a closed term occurring above an uppermost (D_i) with the local stack c_i. Then $t \in \mathcal{H}_{c_i}(D_i(c_i\oplus))$ where $v(D_1(c\oplus)) = \Psi_{\rho_0}(v(c))$ and $v(D_0(c\oplus)) = \Psi_{\omega_1}(v(c))$.

(p2.2) Let J be one of rules $(D_i)_\alpha$ occurring in $\mathcal{P}$, Γ the lower sequent, and Γ_0 the upper sequent of J. Then $\alpha \geq D_i(c \oplus o(\Gamma_0))$, where $c = stk(o(\Gamma))$.

(p3) The final part of $\mathcal{P}$ consists in a (D_0) followed by a series of paddings, $(p)_{b_i} = (pad)_{b_i}$ such that $b_i \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

$$\mathcal{P} = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dfrac{\dfrac{\Lambda}{\Lambda}\,(D_0)}{\Lambda}\,(p)_{b_0} \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\Lambda}{\Lambda}\,(p)_{b_n} \end{array}$$

Also there is no (D_0) above the final (D_0), i.e., the final is the unique rule (D_0) in $\mathcal{P}$, which is a bottleneck of $\mathcal{P}$.

From **(p3)** and Proposition 5.6.1 we see that $dom(o(\Gamma_{end})) \in \{0, 1, \omega\}$ for the end-sequent Γ_{end} of $\mathcal{P}$.

Lemma 6.10 (Inversion)
Let $\mathcal{P}$ a proof of $\Gamma, \forall x\, A(x)$, and t a closed term. Let o be an o.a. for sequents in $\mathcal{P}$. Then there exists a proof $\mathcal{P}'$ of $\Gamma, A(t)$ and an o.a. o' such that $o'(\Gamma, A(t)) = o(\Gamma, \forall x\, A(x))$.

The same holds for proofs ending with $\Gamma, A_0 \wedge A_1$ for conjunctive formulas $A_0 \wedge A_1$.

Proof. Substitute t for x in $\mathcal{P}$ to get a proof $\mathcal{P}'$ of $\Gamma, A(t)$. Consider (ind)'s, and let s be the induction term in which x occurs. Then let $mj(s[x := t]) := \rho_0 = mj(s)$ in the o.a. o' even if $s[x := t]$ is a closed term. □

Lemma 6.11 (False literal elimination)
Let A be a false closed literal, and $\mathcal{P}$ a proof of Γ, A enjoying the condition **(p2)**. *Let o be an o.a. for sequents in $\mathcal{P}$. Then there exists a proof $\mathcal{P}'$ of Γ and an o.a. o' such that $o'(\Gamma) = o(\Gamma, A)$.*

Proof. Eliminate the ancestors A of A to get a proof $\mathcal{P}'$ of Γ. Consider first $(P\Sigma_1)$.

$$\frac{\Gamma, \varphi[\omega_1, s]; a}{\Gamma, (\neg P(t_0, t_1), s \not< t_0,)\varphi^{t_1}[t_0, s]; a}\ (P\Sigma_1)$$

If one of literals $\neg P(t_0, t_1), s \not< t_0$ is a false ancestor of A, then eliminate it from the lower sequent. The case $(P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1)$ is similar. $\Box$

6.2 Embedding

An $(n_0, \mathcal{F}_0)$-ordinal assignment o defined in Definition 6.6 attaches hydras to axioms $(P_{\rho_0}\exists)$ in a restricted way. The reason for the restriction is to guarantee the existence of an ordinal assignment enjoying the condition that two upper sequents of a rule $(\wedge)$ or a rule (Rfl) have to receive the same hydras.

Lemma 6.12 *Suppose that T_1 is inconsistent. Then there exist a positive integer n_0, a finite set $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_\mu$ and a proof $\mathcal{P}_0$ of the empty sequent with an $(n_0, \mathcal{F}_0)$-o.a. o_0 such that $(\mathcal{P}_0, o_0)$ is a proof with o.a.*

Suppose that T_1 is inconsistent, or equivalently $T^{ord}(\omega_1)$ is inconsistent. We show that there exists a proof $\mathcal{P}_0$ of the empty sequent and an $(n_0, \mathcal{F}_0)$-o.a. o_0 such that $(\mathcal{P}_0, o_0)$ is a proof with o.a. for some $n_0, \mathcal{F}_0$.

Let $\mathcal{Q}_0$ be a proof figure of $\neg\forall z < \omega_1 \exists x, y < \omega_1[z < x \wedge P(x, y)]$, i.e., the negation of the axiom (6) from axioms in T_2 except Π_2-Reflection, axioms (5), (7), (8) and (9).

In what follows $\mathcal{F}_0$ denotes the set of function symbols f_A for Δ_0-formulas A occurring in $\mathcal{Q}_0$.

Each leaf in $\mathcal{Q}_0$ is either a logical one $(taut)$ or one of axioms in T_2 except Π_2-Reflection, axioms (5), (7), (8) and (9). Inference rules in $\mathcal{Q}_0$ are logical ones, $(\vee), (\wedge), (\exists), (\forall)$ and (cut).

Let us depict pieces of proofs of each leaf in $\mathcal{Q}_0$ except $(taut)$'s together with possible ordinal assignments, and show that there are n_0, m_0 such that for any $n \geq n_0$ and any $m \geq m_0$, there exists an o.a. o such that $o(\Gamma) = (n, m) = n \cdot \rho_0 + \rho_0 \cdot m$ for all leaves Γ in $\mathcal{Q}_0$.

1. When $\forall \vec{x}\, A$ is the universal closure of an axiom in T_2 except Foundation and Π_2-Reflection schema, replace the leaf $\Gamma, \forall \vec{x}\, A$ by

$$\cfrac{\cfrac{\cfrac{}{\Gamma, A; (n+1, 0)}\ (ax)}{\Gamma, \forall \vec{x}\, A}\ (\forall)}{\Gamma, \forall \vec{x}\, A; (n+1, m)}\ (pad)_{\rho_0}$$

   for any n, m with m times $(pad)_{\rho_0}$'s.

2. Leaves for axioms (5), (7) and (8) are derived from inference rules $(P\Sigma_1)$, $(P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1)$ and $(P_{\rho_0}\exists)$, resp. For example,

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \neg\varphi[y], \varphi[y]; (n+1, d)\end{array}}{\Gamma, \neg P_{\rho_0}(x), y \not< x, \neg\varphi[y], \varphi^x[y]; (n+1, d)}\,(P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1)}{\Gamma, \forall x, y(\neg P_{\rho_0}(x) \vee y \not< x \vee \neg\varphi[y] \vee \varphi^x[y]); (n+1, d+6)}\,(\vee)_{\rho_0}, (\forall)$$

with 6 times $(\vee)_{\rho_0}$, and $d \geq \mathrm{dp}(\varphi[y]) - 1 = 1$.

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\Gamma, \exists x[y < x \wedge P_{\rho_0}(x)]; (n+1, m+1)}\,(P_{\rho_0}\exists)}{\Gamma, \forall y(\exists x[y < x \wedge P_{\rho_0}(x)]); (n+1, m+3)}\,(\vee)_{\rho_0}, (\forall)$$

3. Leaves for Foundation schema are replaced by

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \forall x < y\, A(x), \neg\forall x < y A(x); d\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \neg A(y), A(y)\end{array}}{\Gamma, \neg Prg, \neg\forall x < y A(x), A(y); d+1}\,(\wedge), (\exists)_1 \quad \begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \Delta, A(x), \neg A(x); d-1\end{array}}{x \not< y, \Gamma, \Delta; (2d+1, 0)}\,(ind)}{\Gamma, \neg Prg, \forall x < y\, A(y)}\,(b\forall) \quad \begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \neg Prg, \neg\forall x < y\, A(x), A(y); (0, d+1)\end{array}}{\dfrac{\Gamma, \neg Prg, A(y); (2d+1, d+1)}{\Gamma, \forall y(\forall x < y\, A(x) \to A(y)) \to \forall y\, A(y); (2d+1, d+3)}\,(\forall), (\vee)_1}\,(cut)$$

where $\Delta = \{\neg Prg, A(x)\}$ with $Prg \equiv (\forall y(\forall x < y\, A(x) \to A(y)))$ and $\omega > d \geq \mathrm{dp}(\forall x < y\, A(x)) > \mathrm{dp}(A(x))$. Also $(2d+1, 0) = (d+1+d-1+1) \cdot \rho_0$ with $\rho_0 = mj(y)$.

Observe that this piece enjoys the condition **(p1)**.

4. Leaves for (9) are replaced by

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \Delta, \forall x < z\, A(x); (n+1, d)\end{array} \quad \dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \exists x < z\, \neg A^{(y)}(x), \forall x < z\, A^{(y)}(x), \Gamma; (n+1, d-1)\end{array}}{z \not< y, \exists x < z\, \neg A^{(y)}(x), \Gamma, \Delta; (n+1, d)}\,(\exists)_{\rho_0}}{\Gamma, \Delta; (n+1, d+1)}\,(Rfl)}{\Gamma, \forall x < z\, A(x) \to \exists y \forall x < z\, \neg A^{(y)}(x); (n+1, d+3)}\,(\vee)_{\rho_0}$$

for $\Delta = \{\neg\forall x < z\, A(x), \exists y \forall x < z\, A^{(y)}(x)\}$ and $\omega > d \geq \mathrm{dp}(\forall x < z\, A^{(y)}(x)) > \mathrm{dp}(\forall x < z\, A(x))$.

Next consider inference rules in $\mathcal{Q}_0$. At each $(\vee)$, add ρ_0, i.e., replace it by $(\vee)_{\rho_0}$. The same for $(\exists)$ introducing an existential formula. For $(\wedge)$ we can assume that both upper sequents receive the same ordinal.

Finally consider a (cut):

$$\dfrac{\Gamma, \neg A \quad A, \Delta}{\Gamma, \Delta}\,(cut)$$

Replace it by

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \neg A\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ A, \Delta\end{array}}{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg A \wedge A; (n,m)}\,(\wedge) \qquad \dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ A, \neg A; (0,d)\end{array}}{A \vee \neg A; (0, d+2)}\,(\vee)_{\rho_0}}{\Gamma, \Delta; (n, m+d+2)}\,(cut)$$

where $\omega > d \geq \mathrm{dp}(A)$.

Note that there occurs no inference rules (D_i) for $i = 0, 1$ in the constructed $\mathcal{Q}_0$.

Let $\mathcal{Q}_1$ be the proof of $\neg \forall z < \omega_1 \exists x, y < \omega_1 [z < x \wedge P(x, y)]$ obtained from $\mathcal{Q}_0$ as described above with an ordinal $(n, m) = n \cdot \rho_0 + \rho_0 \cdot m$. Add a (cut) with the axiom $(P\exists)$ and some (h)'s respecting **(h4)** and **(h5)** to get a proof $\mathcal{Q}_2$:

$$\mathcal{Q}_2 = \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{}{z \not< \omega_1, \exists x, y < \omega_1[z < x \wedge P(x,y)]; \omega_1}\,(P\exists)}{\forall z < \omega_1 \exists x, y < \omega_1[z < x \wedge P(x,y)]}\,(b\forall) \qquad \begin{array}{c}\vdots\ \mathcal{Q}_1\\ \neg \forall z < \omega_1 \exists x, y < \omega_1[z < x \wedge P(x,y)]; (n,m)\end{array}}{\emptyset}\,(cut)}{\emptyset; b_1}\,(h)$$

where $b_1 = \omega_k(\omega_1 + n \cdot \rho_0 + \rho_0 \cdot m)$ with the number k of (h)'s.

Next let

$$\mathcal{Q}_3 = \begin{array}{c}\vdots\ \mathcal{Q}_2\\ \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\emptyset; b_1}{\emptyset; \alpha_1}\,(D_1)_{\alpha_1}}{\emptyset; b_0}\,(h)}{\emptyset; \alpha_0}\,(D_0)_{\alpha_0}\end{array}$$

where $\alpha_1 = D_1(\emptyset \oplus b_1)$ with the empty stack $\emptyset$. Obviously α_1 is well-behaved. The conditions **(h2)**, **(h3)** and **(h5)** are fulfilled with the introduced rule $(D_1)_{\alpha_1}$. $b_0 = \omega_q(\alpha_1)$ with the number q of (h)'s respecting **(h6)** and $\alpha_0 = D_0(c_0 \oplus b_0)$ with $c_0 = \omega_p(\rho_0 + 1) > b_1$, where $\omega_p(\rho_0 + 1) = D_2(\cdots D_2(D_2(0)) \cdots)$ with $(p + 1)$'s D_2. Then **(p2.2)** is enjoyed for $\mathcal{Q}_3$, and $M(b_1) = M(b_0) = G_1(b_1) = \emptyset$, $G_0(b_0) = \{\emptyset \oplus b_1\}$ for $\alpha_1 = D_1(\emptyset \oplus b_1)$. Hence α_0 is well-behaved.

Let c be a positive integer such that $|(\mathcal{Q}_3, o)| + c \leq 2^{2^c}$. Finally let

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \begin{array}{c}\vdots\ \mathcal{Q}_3\\ \dfrac{\emptyset; \alpha_0}{\emptyset; a_0}\,(pad)_c\end{array}$$

Thus $a_0 = \alpha_0 + c$ and $|(\mathcal{P}_0, o)| \leq 2^{2^c}$.

This $\mathcal{P}_0$ with the o.a. is a proof with o.a. defined in Definition 6.9. Since there occurs no constant other than $0, \omega_1$ in $\mathcal{P}_0$, the condition **(p2.1)** holds vacuously. Obviously we have $a_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$. This shows Lemma 6.12.

7 Reductions on finite proof figures

For a proof $\mathcal{Q}_3$ of $\emptyset; \alpha_0$ in the proof of Lemma 6.12 and $i \leq c$, let

$$\mathcal{P}_i = \begin{array}{c} \vdots\ \mathcal{Q}_3 \\ \dfrac{\emptyset}{\emptyset}\ (pad)_{c-i} \end{array}$$

Then $o(\mathcal{P}_i) = \alpha_0 + (c-i)$, and $a_c = o(\mathcal{P}_c) = a_0[0] \cdots [c-1]$. Obviously $|(\mathcal{P}_c, o)| \leq 2^{2^c}$. Each term (possibly with variables) occurring in $\mathcal{Q}_3$, i.e., occurring in $\mathcal{P}_0$ is a term over constants in $\{0, 1, \omega_1\}$, some finite number of variables and function symbols in $\{+, \lambda x.\omega^x\} \cup \mathcal{F}_0$.

s. In what follows let $(\mathcal{P}, o)$ be a proof with an o.a. o with $o(\Gamma_{end}) \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for the end-sequent Γ_{end} of false Δ_0-formulas, and $n > c$ an integer. Assume that $o(\mathcal{P})$ is well-behaved and $|(\mathcal{P}, o)| \leq 2^{2^n}$. Then another proof $(\mathcal{P}', o')$ is constructed so that $o'(\mathcal{P}') = (o(\mathcal{P}))[n]$ and $|(\mathcal{P}', o')| \leq 2^{2^{n+1}}$. This proves Lemma 5.10.

Note that when each term t' in $\mathcal{P}'$ is obtained from terms t, s occurring in $\mathcal{P}$ by a substitution $t' \equiv t[x := s]$, then the condition $|t'| \leq (2^{2^n})^2 = 2^{2^{n+1}}$ follows from $|t|, |s| \leq 2^{2^n}$. Also by Proposition 5.6.1 we have $|(o(\mathcal{P}))[n]| \leq \max\{2^{2^n} \cdot 2 + 2^{2^n}, 2^{2^n} \cdot 3\} < 2^{2^{n+1}}$ if $|o(\mathcal{P})| \leq 2^{2^n}$.

In each case below the new o.a. o' for the new proof $\mathcal{P}'$ is defined obviously from the o.a. o and the subscripts b of the displayed inference rules.

Definition 7.1 The *main branch* of a proof figure $\mathcal{P}$ is a series $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i \leq n}$ of occurrences of sequents in $\mathcal{P}$ such that:

1. Γ_0 is the end-sequent of $\mathcal{P}$.
2. For each $i < n$, Γ_{i+1} is the *rightmost* upper sequent of a rule J_i with its lower sequent Γ_i, and J_i is one of the rules $(cut), (h), (pad)_0, {}_b(pad)$, and $(P\Sigma_1), (P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1), (D_i)\ (i = 0, 1)$.
3. Either Γ_n is an axiom or Γ_n is the lower sequent of one of rules $(\vee), (\wedge), (\exists), (b\exists), (b\forall), (ind), (Rfl)$, and $(pad)_b$ with $b \neq 0$.

Γ_n is said to be the *top* of the main branch of $\mathcal{P}$.

Let Φ denote the top of the main branch of the proof $\mathcal{P}$ with the o.a. o. Observe that we can assume Φ contains no free variable.

7.1 top=padding

In this subsection we consider the cases when the top Φ is a lower sequent of one of rules $(p)_b = (pad)_b$ with $b \neq 0$ or one of rules $(p)_b = (\vee)_b, (\exists)_b, (b\exists)_b$ or an explicit $(p)_b = (b\forall)_b, (\wedge)_b$ with $b > 1$.

Case 1. $dom(b) = \omega$. Then $dom(o(\mathcal{P})) = dom(b)$.

$$\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \cdots ; a_0\end{array}}{\Phi ; a_0 + b}\ (p)_b$$

is replaced by

$$\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \cdots ; a_0\end{array}}{\Phi ; a_0 + b[n]}\ (p)_{b[n]}$$

The condition **(p2.2)** is fulfilled with the replacement $\mathcal{P}'$ by Lemma 5.7.

Case 2. $dom(b) = \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for $i = 0, 1$: $b = b[D_{i+1}(0)]$ and $dom(o(\mathcal{P})) = \omega$. Consider the uppermost (D_v) $(v \leq i)$ on the main branch at which D_v is applied for hydra. Such a (D_v) exists by **(p3)**.

$$\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \cdots ; a_0\end{array}}{\Phi ; a_0 + b[D_{i+1}(0)]}\ (p)_b\\ \vdots\\ \cdots\end{array}}{\Gamma ; D_v(c \oplus a[D_{i+1}(0)])}\ (D_v)$$

where $c = stk(o(\Gamma))$.

We have $(D_v(c \oplus a))[n] = \ell \cdot v + r$ with $\ell = D_v(c \oplus a[1])$ and $r = D_v((c + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus a[1])$. For $v = 1$,

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \cdots ; a_0\end{array}}{\Phi ; a_0 + b[1]}\ (p)_{b[1]}\\ \vdots\\ \cdots\end{array}}{\Gamma ; r}\ (D_1)}{\Gamma ; (D_1(c \oplus a))[n]}\ {}_{\ell}(pad)$$

For $v = 0$,

$$\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \cdots ; a_0\end{array}}{\Phi ; a_0 + b[1]}\ (p)_{b[1]}\\ \vdots\\ \cdots\end{array}}{\Gamma ; r}\ (D_0)$$

Case 3. $b = b_0 + 1$, $dom(b) = 1 = dom(o(\mathcal{P}))$: Then $(p)_b = (pad)_b$.

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots; a_0}{\Phi; a_0 + b_0 + 1}\ (p)_b \\ \vdots \\ \cdots; a + b_0 + 1 \end{array}$$

is replaced by

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots; a_0}{\Phi; a_0 + b_0}\ (p)_{b_0} \\ \vdots \\ \cdots; a + b_0 \end{array}$$

Case 4. $b = b_0 + 1$, $dom(o(\mathcal{P})) = \omega$, and $b_0 \neq 0$ when $(p)_b \neq (pad)_b$: Consider the uppermost (D_v) $(v = 0, 1, 2)$ on the main branch at which D_v is applied for hydra. Let Γ be the lower sequent of the (D_v), i.e., the uppermost sequent below the top Φ such that $h(\Gamma) < h(\Phi)$ or Γ is the lower sequent of a (D_i) for $i = 0, 1$. Let us write $D_2(a)$ for ω^a. We have $(D_v(d \oplus (a + b_0 + 1)))[n] = c \cdot 2$ for $c = D_v(d \oplus (a + b_0))$.

$$\mathcal{P} = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a_0}{\Phi;\ a_0 + b_0 + 1}\ (p)_b \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a + b_0 + 1}{\Gamma;\ D_v(d \oplus (a + b_0 + 1))} \\ \vdots \end{array}$$

Replace the $(p)_{b_0+1}$ by $(p)_{b_0}$ and insert a new $(pad)_c$ immediately below Γ. Note that $c \in \mathcal{H}_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$ when $v = 0$, cf. **(p3)**.

$$\mathcal{P}' := \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a_0}{\Phi;\ a_0 + b_0}\ (p)_{b_0} \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\dfrac{\cdots;\ a + b_0}{\Gamma;\ D_v(d \oplus (a + b_0))}}{\Gamma;\ c \cdot 2}\ (pad)_c \\ \vdots \end{array}$$

Case 5. $dom(b) \in \{multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0), multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0) : t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0), c_1 \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)\}$.

$$\mathcal{P} = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a_0}{\Phi;\ a_0 + b}\ (p)_b \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a}{\Gamma;\ D_0(c_0 \oplus a)} \\ \vdots \end{array}$$

where $dom(a) \in \{multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0), multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0) : t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0), c_1 \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)\}$.

Let $multi_n$ denote the set $multi_{t,0,n}(c_1, c_0; \mathcal{F}_0)$ when $dom(a) = multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$. Otherwise $multi_n$ denotes the set $multi_{t,0,n}(c_0; \mathcal{F}_0)$. Let $s_n \in multi_n$ be a term such that $(D_0(c_0 \oplus a))[n] = D_0(c_0 \oplus a[s_n])$. Let

$$\mathcal{P}' = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a_0}{\Phi;\ a_0 + b[s_n]}\ (p)_{b[s_n]} \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a[s_n]}{\Gamma;\ D_0(c_0 \oplus a[s_n])} \\ \vdots \end{array}$$

The condition **(p2.2)** is fulfiiled with $\mathcal{P}'$ by Lemma 5.7.

7.2 top=axiom

In this subsection we consider the cases when the top Φ is an axiom.

Case 1. The top $\Phi = A, \Delta_0$ is either an (ax) or a $(taut)$. Then Φ contains a true Δ_0-formula A or a true atomic formula $A = (\neg)P(t_0, t_1), (\neg)P_{\rho_0}(t)$. In each case $\mathrm{dp}(A) = 1$. Let $\Phi; b$.

Case 1.1. $dom(b) = \omega$: As in **Case 1** of subsection 7.1 replace

$$\overline{\Phi; b}$$

by

$$\overline{\Phi; b[n]}$$

Case 1.2. $dom(b) = \mathcal{H}_i(\mathcal{F}_0)$ for $i = 0, 1$: Then as in **Case 2** of subsection 7.1 replace $\mathcal{P}$

$$\overline{\Phi; b[D_{i+1}(0)]}$$

by the following $\mathcal{P}'$

$$\overline{\Phi; b[1]}$$

and insert a $_{\ell}(pad)$ below a (D_1) if it is needed to have $o(\mathcal{P})[n] = o(\mathcal{P}')$.

Case 1.3. $b = b_0 + 1$ with $b_0 \neq 0$: As in **Case 4** of subsection 7.1, replace

$$\overline{\Phi; b_0 + 1}$$

by

$$\overline{\Phi; b_0}$$

and insert a $(pad)_c$ under the uppermost (D_v) below the top Φ in $\mathcal{P}$, and $D_2(a) = \omega^a$ and $(D_2) = (h)$.

Case 1.4. $dom(b) \in \{multi_{t,2}(\mathcal{F}_0), multi_{t,1}(c_1; \mathcal{F}_0) : t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0), c_1 \subset \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}_0)\}$: As in **Case 5** of subsection 7.1, replace

$$\mathcal{P} = \begin{array}{c} \overline{\Phi;\ b} \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a}{\Gamma;\ D_0(c_0 \oplus a)} \\ \vdots \end{array}$$

by

$$\mathcal{P}' = \begin{array}{c} \overline{\Phi;\ b[s_n]} \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots;\ a[s_n]}{\Gamma;\ D_0(c_0 \oplus a[s_n])} \\ \vdots \end{array}$$

for a term s_n.

Case 1.5. $b = 1$.
Case 1.5.1. There exists a (D_v) between the top and the vanishing cut: Consider the uppermost such (D_v) at which D_v is applied for hydra. We have $v = 1, 2$ by **(p3)**.

$$\begin{array}{c} \dfrac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \Gamma, \neg A; a \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} A, \Delta_0; 1 \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{A, \cdots; b_0 + 1}{A, \Delta_1; D_v(c_v \oplus (b_0 + 1))}\ (D_v) \\ \vdots \\ A, \Delta; b \end{array}}{\Gamma, \Delta; a + b}\ (cut) \\ \vdots \\ \Gamma_{end} : a_1 \end{array}$$

Let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following with the false Δ_0-formula $\neg A$ down to the end-sequent Γ_{end}.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Gamma, \neg A; a}{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg A; a + b[n]}\ (pad)_{b[n]}\\
\vdots\\
\Gamma_{end}, \neg A : a_1[n]
\end{array}$$

where $b[n] = b[D_v(c_v \oplus b_0) \cdot 2]$ for $b = b[D_v(c_v \oplus (b_0 + 1))]$.

Case 1.5.2. Otherwise: Consider the uppermost $(D_v)\,(v = 0, 1, 2)$ below the vanishing cut. Such a (D_v) exists by **(p3)**.

$$\mathcal{P} = \begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \neg A;\ a\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}A, \Delta_0; 1\\ \vdots\\ A, \Delta;\ b + 1\end{array}}{\Gamma, \Delta;\ a + b + 1}\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\cdots; a_0 + 1}{\cdots; D_v(c_v \oplus (a_0 + 1))}\ (D_v)\\
\vdots\\
\Gamma_{end} : a_1
\end{array}$$

where $(D_v(c_v \oplus (a_0 + 1)))[n] = D_v(c_v \oplus a_0) \cdot 2$. Let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following with the false Δ_0-formula $\neg A$.

$$\mathcal{P}' := \begin{array}{c}
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Gamma, \neg A;\ a}{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg A; a + b}\ (pad)_c\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\dfrac{\cdots; a_0}{\cdots; D_v(c_v \oplus a_0)}\ (D_v)}{\cdots; D_v(c_v \oplus a_0) \cdot 2}\ (pad)_{D_v(c_v \oplus a_0)}\\
\vdots\\
\Gamma_{end}, \neg A : a_1[n]
\end{array}$$

Case 2. The top is an axiom $(P_{\rho_0}\exists)$.

Let $C \equiv (\exists x[t < x \wedge P_{\rho_0}(x)])$. Consider the uppermost and the lowest (D_1)'s below the (cut) whose cut formula is C. We see that such a (D_1) exists below the cut from **(h3)**.

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{cc}
 & \dfrac{}{\Gamma_0, \exists x[t < x \wedge P_{\rho_0}(x)]; (n_0, m) + D_2(0)}\;(P_{\rho_0}\exists) \\
\vdots & \vdots
\end{array}\\
\dfrac{\Delta_1, \neg C; b_1 \qquad\qquad C, \Gamma_1; a_1[D_2(0)]}{\Gamma_1, \Delta_1; b_1 + a_1[D_2(0)]}\;(cut)\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Gamma; a[D_2(0)]}{\Gamma'; c_1 \oplus a}\;(D_1)_\alpha\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\cdots}{\cdots; D_1(c_1 \oplus a)}\;(D_1)_\beta
\end{array}
$$

where there is no (D_1) above the (cut) by **(h2)**. $(D_1(c_1 \oplus a))[n] = \ell + r$ for $\ell = D_1(c_1 \oplus a[1])$ and $r = D_1((c_1 + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus a[1])$.

Since $t \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1\oplus)) \cap D_2(0) = D_1(c_1\oplus)$ by **(p2.1)**, we have $t < D_1(c_1 \oplus a[1]) = \ell$. By inversions for the A-formula $\neg C$ and eliminating false literals $t \not< \ell, \neg P_{\rho_0}(\ell)$ we obtain the following $\mathcal{P}'$, cf. Lemma 6.10

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\vdots\; x := \ell\\
\dfrac{\Delta_1; b_1}{\Gamma_1, \Delta_1; b_1 + a_1[1]}\;(pad)_{a_1[0]}\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Gamma; a[1]}{\Gamma'; (1 + c_1) \oplus a[1]}\;(D_1)_\alpha\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\dfrac{\cdots}{\cdots; D_1((c_1 + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus a[1])(= r)}\;(D_1)_\beta}{\Gamma'; \ell + r}\;{}_\ell(pad)
\end{array}
$$

Let us check the condition **(p2.1)** for the $(D_1)_\alpha$ in $\mathcal{P}'$. Any term occurring in $\mathcal{P}'$ is in the closure of ℓ and terms occurring in $\mathcal{P}$ under $+, \omega$. Hence it suffices to show $\ell = D_1(c_1 \oplus a[1]) \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1 + D_2(a[1]) + 1}(D_1((c_1 + D_2(a[1]) + 1)\oplus)$, which follows from $c_1 \oplus a[1] \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1\oplus))$ and $v(c_1 \oplus a[1]) = v(c)\#\omega^{v(a[1])} < v(c_1 + D_2(a[1]) + 1)$.

The condition **(p2.2)** is fulfilled with $\mathcal{P}'$ by Lemma 5.7.

Case 3. The top is an axiom $(P\exists)$.

If $t \not< \omega_1$, then replace the axiom

$$\dfrac{}{\Gamma_0, t \not< \omega_1, \exists x, y \in \omega_1[t < x \wedge P(x, y)]; D_1(0)}\;(P\exists)$$

by

$$\dfrac{}{\Gamma_0, t \not< \omega_1, \exists x, y \in \omega_1[t < x \wedge P(x, y)]; D_1(0)}\;(ax)$$

Let t be a closed term such that $v(t) < \omega_1$, and $C \equiv (\exists x, y < \omega_1[t < x \land P(x,y)])$.

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{cc}
 & \dfrac{}{\Gamma_0, t \not< \omega_1, \exists x, y < \omega_1[t < x \land P(x,y)]; D_1(0)}\ (P\exists) \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
\end{array} \\
\dfrac{\Delta_1, \neg C; b_1 \qquad\qquad\qquad C, \Gamma_1; a_1[D_1(0)]}{\Gamma_1, \Delta_1; b_1 + a_1[D_1(0)]}\ (cut) \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Lambda; a[D_1(0)]}{\Lambda; D_0(c_0 \oplus a)}\ (D_0)_\alpha
\end{array}
$$

where there occurs a rule (D_0) below the (cut), and there occurs no (D_0) above the (cut) by **(p3)**.

Let $(D_0(c_0 \oplus a))[n] = r$ for $\alpha \geq D_0(c_0 \oplus a) > \ell = D_0(c_0 \oplus a[1])$ and $r = D_0((c_0 + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus a[1])$. Then $\ell > v(t)$ by $t \in \mathcal{H}_{c_0}(D_0(c_0 \oplus)) \cap D_1(0) = D_0(c_0 \oplus) < \ell$, **(p2.1)**. Let $s = F(c_0 \oplus 0)$, i.e., $v(s) = F_{\ell \cup \{\omega_1\}}(\rho_0)$.

By inversions for the A-formula $\neg C$ and eliminating false literals $\ell \not< \omega_1, s \not< \omega_1, t \not< \ell, \neg P(\ell, s)$ we obtain, cf. Lemma 6.10

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\vdots\ x := \ell, y := s \\
\dfrac{\Delta_1; b_1}{\Gamma_1, \Delta_1; b_1 + a_1[1]}\ (pad)_{a_1[1]} \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Lambda; a[1]}{\Lambda; D_0((c_0 + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus a[1])}\ (D_0)_\alpha
\end{array}
$$

Let us check the condition **(p2.1)** for the $(D_0)_\alpha$ in $\mathcal{P}'$. Any term occurring in $\mathcal{P}'$ is in the closure of ℓ, s and terms occurring in $\mathcal{P}$ under $+, \omega$. $s \in \mathcal{H}_{c_0 + D_2(a[1]) + 1}(D_0((c_0 + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus))$ follows from $\ell = D_0(c_0 \oplus a[1]) \in \mathcal{H}_{c_0 + D_2(a[1]) + 1}(D_0((c_0 + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus))$, which in turn follows from $c_0 \oplus a[1] \in \mathcal{H}_{c_0}(D_0(c_0 \oplus))$.

The condition **(p2.2)** is fulfilled with $\mathcal{P}'$ by Lemma 5.7.

7.3 top=rule

In this subsection we consider the cases when the top Φ is a lower sequent of one of explicit rules $(\lor), (\land), (\exists), (b\exists), (b\forall)$ or (Rfl) or one of rules $(\lor)_b, (\exists)_b$ with $dom(b) = 1$.

Case 1. The top is the lower sequent of an explicit logical rule J. Since the end-sequent consists solely of false closed Δ_0-formulas, the main formula of J is also closed. By virtue of subsection 7.1 we can assume that $b = 1$ for the added hydra b at J.

Case 1.1. J is a $(b\forall)$: Consider the uppermost rule $(D_v)\,(v = 0, 1, 2)$ below J where D_v is applied for hydra. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the following.

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, y \not< t, \neg A(y); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \forall y < t\, \neg A(y); a_0 + 1}\;(b\forall)\; J \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma, \forall y < t\, \neg A(y); b + 1}{\Gamma, \forall y < t\, \neg A(y); D_v(c \oplus (b + 1))}\;(D_v)
\end{array}
$$

where $\forall y < t\, \neg A(y)$ is a closed false Δ_0-formula. Note that the predicate P_{ρ_0} does not occur in any Δ_0-formula, and hence any (D_1) does not change the descendants of the formula $\forall y < t\, \neg A(y)$. $\neg A(s)$ is a false Δ_0-formula with the closed term $s = \mu y < t.A(y)$. Let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following with the false $\neg A(s)$.

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\vdots\; y := s \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, \neg A(s); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \forall y < t\, \neg A(y), \neg A(s); a_0} \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\dfrac{\Gamma, \forall y < t\, \neg A(y), \neg A(s); b}{\Gamma, \forall y < t\, \neg A(y), \neg A(s); D_v(c \oplus b)}\;(D_v)}{\Gamma, \forall y < t\, \neg A(y), \neg A(s); D_v(c \oplus (b + 1))[n]}\;(pad)_{D_v(c \oplus b)}
\end{array}
$$

where $D_v(c \oplus (b + 1))[n] = D_v(c \oplus b) \cdot 2$, the closed term s is substituted for the eigenvariable y, cf. Lemma 6.10, and the false literal $s \not< t$ is eliminated by Lemma 6.11. Note that there is no rule (D_1) above the rule $(b\forall)$ since no free variable occurs below (D_1) by **(h1)**.

Let us check the condition **(p2.1)** for a rule (D_i) with its stack d in $\mathcal{P}'$. Let $A(y) \equiv A(y; t_1, \ldots, t_k)$. Then $f_{\neg A}(t; t_1, \ldots, t_k) = \mu y < t\, \neg A(y) \in \mathcal{H}_d(D_i(d\oplus))$ since $\{t, t_1, \ldots, t_k\} \subset \mathcal{H}_d(D_i(d\oplus))$ by **(p2.1)**.

Case 1.2. J is an $(\exists)_b$:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, A(s); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \exists y\, A(y); a_0 + 1}\;(\exists)\; J \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma, \exists y < t\, A'(y); a
\end{array}
$$

where s is a closed term, and there is a rule J_0 affecting on a descendant $\exists y\, A(y)$ of the main formula. J_0 is one of the rules $(P\Sigma_1), (P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1)$ and (D_1).

If there is a rule $(D_v)\,(v = 1, 2)$ between J and J_0, then insert a $(\exists)_d$ below the (D_v), where $d = D_v(c \oplus b_0)$ with $o(\Delta) = D_v(c \oplus (b_0 + 1))$ for the lower sequent Δ of the (D_v), cf. **Case 4.2** below. Assume that there is no such rule (D_v).

Case 1.2.1. The rule is a $(P\Sigma_1)$: Then $(\exists y\, A(y)) \equiv (\varphi[\omega_1, s_0])$ and $(\exists y < t\, A'(y)) \equiv (\varphi^t[t_0, s_0])$ for some closed terms s_0, t_0.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, A(s); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \exists y\, A(y); a_0 + 1} \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_1, \varphi[\omega_1, s_0]; b + 1}{\Gamma_1, (\neg P(t_0, t), s_0 \not< t_0,)\varphi^t[t_0, s_0]; b + 1}\ (P\Sigma_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma, \exists y < t\, A'(y); a
\end{array}$$

If one of $\neg P(t_0, t)$ and $s_0 \not< t_0$ is true, then let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{}{\Gamma_1, \neg P(t_0, t), s_0 \not< t_0, \varphi^t[t_0, s_0]; b}\ (ax) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma, \exists y < t\, A'(y); a[n]
\end{array}$$

where a false literal $\neg P(t_0, t)$ or $s_0 \not< t_0$ may be absent, and a $(pad)_d$ is inserted to have $o(\mathcal{P}') = o(\mathcal{P})[n]$.

Suppose that both $P(t_0, t)$ and $s_0 < t_0$ are true. Then $\varphi[\omega_1, s_0]$, i.e., , $\exists y\, A(y)$ is false since $\varphi^t[t_0, s_0]$ is false. Hence the closed Δ_0-formula $A(s)$ is false, too. Let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following with a $(pad)_d$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, A(s); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \exists y\, A(y), A(s); a_0} \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_1, \varphi[\omega_1, s_0], A(s); b}{\Gamma_1, (\neg P(t_0, t), s_0 \not< t_0,)\varphi^t[t_0, s_0], A(s); b}\ (P\Sigma_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma, \exists y < t\, A'(y), A(s); a[n]
\end{array}$$

Case 1.2.2. The rule is a $(P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1)$.

Then $(\exists y\, A(y)) \equiv (\varphi[s_0])$ and $(\exists y < t\, A'(y)) \equiv (\exists y < t\, A(y)) \equiv (\varphi^t[s_0])$ for a closed term s_0.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, A(s); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \exists y\, A(y); a_0 + 1} \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_1, \varphi[s_0]; b}{\Gamma_1, (\neg P_{\rho_0}(t), s_0 \not< t,)\varphi^t[s_0]; b + 1}\ (P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma, \exists y < t\, A(y); a
\end{array}$$

If one of $\neg P_{\rho_0}(t)$, $s_0 \not< t$ is true, then let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{}{\Gamma_1, \neg P_{\rho_0}(t), s_0 \not< t, \varphi^t[s_0]; b}\,(ax) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma, \exists y < t\, A(y) : a[n]
\end{array}$$

where a false literal $\neg P_{\rho_0}(t)$, $s_0 \not< t$ may be absent, and a $(pad)_d$ is inserted to have $o(\mathcal{P}') = o(\mathcal{P})[n]$.

Suppose that both $P_{\rho_0}(t)$ and $s_0 < t$ are true. Then $\varphi[s_0]$, i.e., , $\exists y\, A(y)$ is false since $\varphi^t[s_0]$ is false. Hence the closed Δ_0-formula $A(s)$ is false, too. Let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following with a $(pad)_d$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, A(s); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \exists y\, A(y), A(s); a_0} \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_1, \varphi[s_0], A(s); b}{\Gamma_1, (\neg P_{\rho_0}(t), s_0 \not< t,)\varphi^t[s_0], A(s) : b}\,(P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1) \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma, \exists y < t\, A(y), A(s); a[n]
\end{array}$$

Case 1.2.3. There is a $(D_1)_\alpha$ affecting on a descendant $\exists y\, A(y)$ of the main formula.

Then $t = \alpha$ and $A' \equiv A$. $\mathcal{P}$ is of the following form.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, A(s); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \exists y\, A(y); a_0 + 1}\,(\exists)\, J \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\Gamma_1, \exists y\, A(y); b + 1}{\Gamma_1, \exists y < \alpha\, A(y)}\,(D_1)_\alpha \\
\vdots \\
\Gamma, \exists y < \alpha\, A(y); a
\end{array}$$

Let c_1 be the local stack of the uppermost (D_1) below the $(\exists)$. By **(p2.1)** and **(p2.2)** we have $s \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1\oplus)) \cap D_2(0) = D_1(c_1\oplus)$ and $\alpha \geq D_1(c_1 \oplus (b+1))$. Hence $v(s) < D_1(c_1\oplus) \leq \alpha$. Therefore $A(s)$ is false since $\exists y < \alpha\, A(y)$ is false.

Let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following with a $(pad)_d$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Gamma_0, A(s); a_0}{\Gamma_0, \exists y\, A(y), A(s); a_0}\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Gamma_1, \exists y\, A(y), A(s); b}{\Gamma_1, \exists y < \alpha\, A(y), A(s)}\ (D_1)_\alpha\\
\vdots\\
\Gamma, \exists y < \alpha\, A(y), A(s); a[n]
\end{array}$$

Other cases $(\vee), (\wedge), (b\exists)$ are similar.

Case 2. The top is the lower sequent of a (Rfl): Let $A(x) \equiv (\exists z \in P_{\rho_0} \exists w\, B(x))$ $(B \in \Delta_0)$, $A^{(y)}(x) :\equiv (\exists z \in P_{\rho_0} \cap y \exists w < y\, B)$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\Gamma, \forall x < t\, A(x); a_0 \quad t \not< y, \exists x < t \neg A^{(y)}(x), \Gamma; a_0}{\Gamma; a_0 + D_2(0)}\ (Rfl)\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Delta_2; a}{\Delta_2'; a}\ J_1\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Delta_1}{\Delta; D_1(c_1 \oplus a[D_2(0)])}\ J
\end{array}$$

where J_1 is the uppermost $(D_1)_{\alpha_1}$ and J is the lowermost $(D_1)_\alpha$ below the (Rfl). Such a (D_1) exists by **(h6)**.

We have $t \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1 \oplus))$ by **(p2.1)**, and hence $v(t) < \ell = D_1(c_1 \oplus a[1])$. $(D_1(c_1 \oplus a))[n] = \ell + r$ for $r = D_1((c_1 + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus a[1])$. Let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following.

$$\dfrac{
\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\Gamma, \forall x < tA(x); a_0}{\Gamma, \forall x < tA(x); a_0 + 1}\ (pad)_1\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Delta_2, \forall x < tA(x); a[1]}{\dfrac{\Delta_2, \forall x < tA^{(\ell)}(x); a[1]}{\Delta_2', \forall x < tA^{(\ell)}(x); a[1]}}\ (D_1)_\ell\\
\vdots\\
\Delta_1, \forall x < tA^{(\ell)}(x); a[1]
\end{array}}{\Delta, \forall x < tA^{(\ell)}(x); D_1(c_1 \oplus a[1])}
\qquad
\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}
\vdots\ y := \ell\\
\dfrac{\exists x < t\neg A^{(\ell)}(x), \Gamma; a_0}{\exists x < t\neg A^{(\ell}(x), \Gamma; a_0 + 1}\ (pad)_1\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\exists x < t\neg A^{(\ell)}(x), \Delta_2; a[1]}{\exists x < t\neg A^{(\ell)}(x), \Delta_2'; a[1]}\ (D_1)_{\alpha_1}\\
\vdots\\
\exists x < t\neg A^{(\ell)}(x), \Delta_1; a[1]
\end{array}}{\exists x < t\neg A^{(\ell}(x), \Delta; D_1((c_1 + D_2(a[1]) + 1) \oplus a[1])}
}{\Delta; \ell + r}\ (cut)$$

In $\mathcal{P}$, $h(\Delta) \geq \mathrm{dp}(\exists x < t\neg A^{(y)}(x)) = \mathrm{dp}(\forall x < tA^{(b)}(x))$ by **(h6)**. Thus the introduced (cut) in $\mathcal{P}'$ enjoys **(h4)**. There is no (D_1) above the (Rfl) by **(h2)**. There occurs no universal quantifier in the closed formula $\exists x < t \neg A^{(\ell)}(x)$ in the upper sequent of the right rule $(D_1)_{\alpha_1}$, cf. the definition of the rule (D_1). For the condition **(p2.1)** we have $\ell = D_1(c_1 \oplus a[1]) \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1+D_2(a[1])+1}(D_1(c_1+D_2(a[1])+1))$ by $c_1 \oplus a[1] \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1 \oplus))$.

Case 3. The top is the lower sequent of an *(ind)*.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\Gamma, \neg\forall x < y A(x), A(y); a_0 \quad \Gamma, \neg A(s); a_1}{(s \not< t,)\Gamma; a}\ (ind) \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\cdots; b_1}{\cdots; c_1 \oplus b_1}\ (D_1) \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\cdots; b_0}{\cdots; D_0(c_0 \oplus b_0)}\ (D_0)
\end{array}$$

where (D_1) is the uppermost one. Such a (D_1) exists by **(h5)**. There is no (D_1) above the *(ind)* by **(h2)**. By **(p1)** we have $\mathrm{dp}(A(y)) \leq a_1 < a_0 < \omega$.

If $\neg A(y)$ is an E-formula, $a = (a_0 + a_1 + 1) \cdot mj(t)$, where $\rho_0 \geq mj(t) \geq v(t)$ for the closed term $t \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$. Otherwise $a = (a_1 + a_0 + 1) \cdot mj(t)$. Moreover we have $|s| \leq 2^{2^n}$ for $s \in Tm(\mathcal{F}_0)$.

Case 3.1. $s \not< t$: Then the true literal $s \not< t$ remains in the lower sequent.

Eliminate the *(ind)*.

$$\dfrac{}{s \not< t, \Gamma; a}\ (ax)$$

Case 3.2. $s < t$: Let $s_n \in multi_{mj(t),0,n}(c_0, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$ be a term such that $v(s_n) = \max\{v(s_0) : s_0 \in multi_{mj(t),0,n}(c_0, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)\}$. Then $s \leq s_n < mj(t)$ holds since $s \in multi_{t,0,n}(c_0, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0) \subset multi_{mj(t),0,n}(c_0, c_1; \mathcal{F}_0)$ by **(p2.1)**. Let $mj(s) = s_n$.

Assuming $\neg A(s)$ is an $\exists$-formula, let P' be the following:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots \\ \Gamma, \neg\forall x < y A(x), A(y); a_0\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\vdots\ P(A) \\ \Gamma, \neg A(y), A(y); a_1\end{array}}{\Gamma, y \not< s, A(y); (a_0 + a_1 + 1) \cdot mj(s)}\ (ind)}{\Gamma, \forall x < s A(x)}\ (b\forall) \quad \dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\ y := s \\ \Gamma, \neg\forall x < s\, A(x), A(s); a_0\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\vdots \\ \neg A(s), \Gamma; a_1\end{array}}{\neg\forall x < s\, A(x), \Gamma}\ (cut)}{(s \notin t,)\Gamma; a'}\ (cut) \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\cdots; b'_1}{\cdots; c_1 \oplus b'_1}\ (D_1) \\
\vdots \\
\dfrac{\cdots; b'_0}{\cdots; D_0(c_0 \oplus b'_0)}\ (D_0) \qquad\qquad\qquad P'
\end{array}$$

where $P(A)$ denotes a proof of $\Gamma, \neg A(y), A(y)$ which is canonically constructed from logical inferences. For the part of the substitution $[y := s]$, cf. Lemma 6.10.

We have $h_0(\Gamma) \geq \mathrm{dp}(\forall x < a A(x)) > \mathrm{dp}(A(a))$ by **(h5)**, and hence **(h4)** holds for the introduced (cut)'s. Also $a' = (a_0 + a_1 + 1) \cdot mj(s) + a_0 + a_1 =$

$a[mj(s)]$. Since no essentially new term is created here, **(p2.1)** is fulfilled with $\mathcal{P}'$.

If $\neg A(s)$ is not an $\exists$-formula, then upper sequents of the upper cut should be interchanged:

$$\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \forall x < sA(x)\end{array} \qquad \dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \neg A(s), \Gamma; a_1\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \neg\forall x < sA(x), A(s); a_0\end{array}}{\neg\forall x < sA(x), \Gamma}}{(s \not< t,)\Gamma} \qquad P'$$

Case 4. The top Φ is the lower sequent of a logical rules $(\vee)_b, (\exists)_b, (b\exists)_b$. By virtue of subsection 7.1 we can assume $b = 1$. Consider the cases when the logical rule is one of $(\exists)_1, (b\exists)_1$, which is denoted $(\exists)_b$. The case $(\vee)_1$ is similar. Let the main formula of the logical rule be a formula $\exists x < t\, A(x)$ with a minor formula $A(s)$, where t denotes either a term or ρ_0, $(\exists x < \rho_0\, A(x)) :\equiv (\exists x\, A(x))$. Let J denote the (cut) at which the descendant $\exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ of $\exists x < t\, A$ vanishes.

Case 4.1. $\exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ is a Δ_0-formula: Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the following.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \neg\exists x < t'\, A'(x); a\end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c}\dfrac{\exists x < t\, A(x), A(s), \Delta_0; b_0}{\exists x < t\, A(x), \Delta_0; b_0 + 1}\,(\exists)_1\\ \vdots\\ \exists x < t'\, A'(x), \Delta; b\end{array}}{\Gamma, \Delta; a + b}\,(cut)\\
\vdots\\
\Gamma_{end}; c
\end{array}$$

One of $\neg\exists x < t'\, A'(x), \exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ is false. When $\exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ is false, let the false Δ_0-formula $\exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ go down to the end-sequent.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\exists x < t\, A(x), A(s), \Delta_0; b_0}{\exists x < t\, A(x), \Delta_0; b_0 + 1}\,(\exists)_1\\
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\exists x < t'\, A'(x), \Delta; b}{\Gamma, \Delta, \exists x < t'\, A'(x); a + b}\,{}_a(pad)\\
\vdots\\
\Gamma_{end}, \exists x < t'\, A'(x); c
\end{array}$$

This is in **Case 1.2** of this subsection.

When $\exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ is true, we are in **Case 1.1** of this subsection.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots\\
\dfrac{\Gamma, \neg\exists x < t'\, A'(x); a}{\Gamma, \Delta, \neg\exists x < t'\, A'(x); a + b}\,(pad)_b\\
\vdots\\
\Gamma_{end}, \neg\exists x < t'\, A'(x); c
\end{array}$$

In what follows assume that $\exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ is not a Δ_0-formula

Case 4.2. The case when there exists a $(D_v)\,(v = 1, 2)$ between Φ and J at which D_v is applied to hydras. Consider the uppermost such (D_v).

$$\begin{array}{c} \dfrac{\exists x < t\, A(x), A(s), \Delta_0; a_0}{(s \not< t,)\exists x < t\, A(x), \Delta_0; a_0 + 1}\,(\exists)_1 \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots; a+1}{\exists x < t'\, A'(x), \Delta'; D_v(c_v \oplus (a+1))}\,(D_v) \end{array}$$

where $\exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ may differ from $\exists x < t\, A(x)$ due to a rule (D_1) when $(\exists x < t\, A(x)) \equiv (\exists x \in P_{\rho_0} \exists w\, B(x))\,(B \in \Delta_0)$ with $t = \rho_0$. The case $(\exists x < t\, A(x)) \equiv (\exists w\, B(x)))$ is excluded since we are assuming that $\exists x < t'\, A'(x)$ is not a Δ_0-formula. Also the case when a rule $(P\Sigma_1), (P_{\rho_0}\Sigma_1)$ change a descendant of the main formula is excluded.

Then lower the $(\exists)$ below the (D_v).

$$\begin{array}{c} \exists x < t\, A(x), A(s), \Delta_0; a_0 \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\dfrac{\cdots; a}{\exists x < t'\, A'(x), A'(s), \Delta'; D_v(c_v \oplus a)}\,(D_v)}{(s \not< t',)\exists x < t'\, A'(x), \Delta'; D_v(c_v \oplus a) \cdot 2}\,(\exists)_{D_v(c_v \oplus a)} \end{array}$$

We have to verify that this is a legitimate proof. Assume that $v = 1$ and there exists a rule $(D_1)_\alpha$ affecting $(\exists x < t\, A(x)) \equiv (\exists x \in P_{\rho_0} \exists w\, B(x))$, and $(\exists x < t' A'(x)) \equiv (\exists x < \alpha[x \in P_{\rho_0} \land \exists w < \alpha\, B(w)])$ with $t = \rho_0$. We have $s \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1 \oplus))$ by **(p2.1)** and $D_1(c_v \oplus (a+1)) \leq \alpha$ by **(p2.2)**. Hence $v(s) < D_1(c_1 \oplus (a+1)) \leq \alpha = t'$.

Case 4.3. By virtue of **Case 4.2** we can assume that there is no (D_v) between Φ and the vanishing cut at which D_v is applied to hydras for $v = 1, 2$. Then the descendants of the main formula $\exists x < t\, A(x)$ does not change up to the cut formula $\exists x < t\, A(x)$. Note that there is no (D_0) above the $(cut)\, J$, and there is a (D_0) below the vanishing cut by **(p3)**. Let J be the uppermost $(D_v)\,(v = 0, 1, 2)$ at which D_v is applied to hydras.

$$\begin{array}{c} \dfrac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \Gamma, \neg\exists x < t\, A(x); a \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \dfrac{\exists x < t\, A(x), A(s), \Delta_0; b_0}{\exists x < t\, A(x), \Delta_0; b_0 + 1}\,(\exists)_1 \\ \vdots \\ \exists x < t\, A(x), \Delta; b+1 \end{array}}{\Gamma, \Delta; a + b + 1}\,(cut) \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{\cdots; c+1}{\Lambda; D_v(d_v \oplus (c+1))}\,(D_v)\, J \end{array}$$

Since $\exists x < t\, A(x)$ is not a Δ_0-formula, $\mathrm{dp}(\exists x < t\, A(x)) > 0$, and there exists an (h) below the vanishing cut by **(h4)**. This means that J is an (h) and $v = 2$.

Since $h_0(\Gamma, \Delta) \geq \mathrm{dp}(\exists x < t\, A(x)) > \mathrm{dp}(A(s))$, we have $h_0(\Lambda) = h_0(\Gamma, \Delta) - 1 \geq \mathrm{dp}(A(s))$ for **(h4)**. Assuming that $\neg A'(s)$ is an E-formula, let $\mathcal{P}'$ be the following for $(\omega^{c+1})[n] = \omega^c \cdot 2$, cf. Lemma 6.10.

$$
\dfrac{
\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\\ \Gamma, \neg\exists x < t\, A(x); a\end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c}\exists x < t\, A(x), A(s), \Delta_0; b_0\\ \vdots\\ \exists x < t\, A(x), A(s)\Delta; b\end{array}}{\Gamma, \Delta, A(s); a + b}\\ \vdots\\ \cdots; c
\end{array}}{\Lambda, A(s); \omega^c}\,(h)
\qquad
\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}
\dfrac{\begin{array}{c}\vdots\ x := s\\ \neg A(s), \Gamma; a\end{array}}{\neg A(s), \Gamma, \Delta; a + b}\,(pad)_b\\ \vdots\\ \cdots; c
\end{array}}{\neg A(s), \Lambda; \omega^c}\,(h)
}{\Lambda; \omega^c \cdot 2}\,(cut)
$$

Note that there may occur a (D_1) above the (cut). Let $(D_1)_\alpha$ be a rule occurring above the left upper sequent of the (cut) such that its lower sequent contains an ancestor $\neg\exists x < t\, A(x)$ of the left cut formula, and $\neg A \equiv (\exists z \in P_{\rho_0} \cap \alpha \exists w < \alpha\, B(w))$ $(B \in \Delta_0)$. We have to verify the condition **(p2.1)** for the (D_1). Let c_1 be the local stack of the $(D_1)_\alpha$. Then $t \in \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1\oplus)) \cap D_2(0) = D_1(c_1\oplus)$, where $t < D_2(0) = \rho_0$ since there occurs no unbounded universal quantifier in an upper sequent of a rule (D_1) by the definition of the rule. Hence $s < t < D_1(c_1 \oplus 0) \subset \mathcal{H}_{c_1}(D_1(c_1\oplus))$. This shows **(p2.1)**.

This completes a proof of Lemma 5.10.

References

[1] T. Arai, A slow growing analogue to Buchholz' proof, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **54** (1991), 101-120.

[2] T. Arai, Consistency proof via pointwise induction, *Arch. Math. Logic* **37** (1998), 149-165.

[3] T. Arai, Proof theory for theories of ordinals I:recursively Mahlo ordinals, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 122 (2003) 1-85.

[4] T. Arai, Lifting proof theory to the countable ordinals: Zermelo-Fraenkel's set theory, *Jour. Symb. Logic* **79** (2014), 325-354.

[5] W. Buchholz, An independence result for $(\Pi^1_1 - CA) + BI$, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **33** (1987), 131-155.